

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU P.
LIBRARY OF PARIBIBLIOTHEQUE DU P...
LIBRARY OF PARL...

3 2354 00409 715 3

DATE DUE

APR
AVR

APR 15 2005

2005

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

J

103

H7

1934

C5

A1

SESSION 1934

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1934

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1934

WITNESS:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.

OTTAWA
J. O. PATENAUDE
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1934

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, February 16, 1934.

Resolved,—That a Select Special Committee of this House be appointed, to consist of seven members, to be hereinafter named, to inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, with instructions to inquire into and report concerning the repeal or amendment of any of the provisions of the said Act or the substitution therefor or addition thereto of other provisions, as the committee may deem advisable, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to this House.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,

Clerk of the House.

FRIDAY, February 23, 1934.

Ordered,—That Messrs. Bowman, Chevrier, Ernst, Laurin, Lawson, MacInnis and Pouliot do constitute the Select Special Committee of this House pursuant to the motion adopted on the 16th day of February, 1934, to enquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, etc.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,

Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, February 28, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 10.45 a.m.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Bowman, Pouliot and MacInnis.

Upon nomination for chairman being called by the clerk, the name of Mr. Lawson was put in nomination by Mr. MacInnis.

No further nominations being made the clerk declared Mr. Lawson elected chairman.

Mr. Lawson took the chair.

On motion of Mr. Bowman, it was resolved that leave be asked of the House to print the day to day proceedings and evidence, 500 copies in English and 200 copies in the French language.

Mr. MacInnis moved that it be recommended to the House that the committee be empowered to sit while the House is sitting. Carried.

Discussion as to procedure followed.

It was decided, subject to change from time to time, that the committee would meet on Wednesdays.

In the event of Bill No. 4, an Act respecting the Bureau of Translations, being referred to the committee this week, the committee would take the said Bill under consideration at its next meeting. If said Bill was not then referred the committee would hear representations from the Civil Service Commissioners.

Subject to the foregoing, that if and when Bill No. 4 was referred that the same should have precedence over other business.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, March 7, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, March 7, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Chevrier, MacInnis, Bowman, Pouliot and Laurin.

The committee took under consideration the Order of Reference, dated Friday, February 16, 1934, viz.:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FRIDAY, February 16, 1934.

Resolved,—That a Select Special Committee of this House be appointed, to consist of seven members, to be hereinafter named, to inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, with instructions to inquire into and report concerning the repeal or amendment

of any of the provisions of the said Act or the substitution therefor or addition thereto of other provisions, as the committee may deem advisable, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to this House.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,

Clerk of the House.

Mr. Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, appeared before the committee, on request.

Mr. Bland suggested that the committee might take under consideration the question of long term temporaries in the public service and the advisability of recommending that certain classes of such temporaries be made permanent.

The matter was discussed at some length when it was ordered that Mr. Bland prepare a statement of the personnel in this class and other related facts, together with such suggestions as the Civil Service Commission may see fit to make in respect thereto.

Mr. Bland, in his remarks, referred to and filed Orders in Council, P.C. 2958, dated December 6, 1920, and P.C. 24/829, dated May 5, 1927 (*see Appendix hereto.*)

Mr. Bland also referred to the recommendation of the Civil Service Committee of 1932, respecting co-ordination and amalgamation of certain services and the action taken by the Commission thereon.

Mr. Bland was requested to submit a report of the Commission of recommendations in this regard.

A motion by Mr. Chevrier that the Commission report the extent to which the recommendations contained in paragraphs 11 to 26 inclusive of the Report of 1932 had been acted upon, was lost on division.

A motion by Mr. MacInnis that the Commission report the extent to which the recommendations contained in paragraphs 11 to 23 inclusive of the said report, had been acted upon, was adopted.

It was decided that in the event of Bill No. 4, an Act respecting the Bureau of Translations, being referred to the committee prior to the next meeting, that the committee would proceed with the said Bill in precedence to all other matters.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, March 14, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 7, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act, met at 11 A.M., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding:

The CHAIRMAN: As the Translation Bill has not been referred to this Committee; and as the Clerk in pursuance of the Committee's intimation last sitting has requested the Civil Service Commission to send a representative here to make any suggestions or representations on matters to be considered, Mr. Bland is here this morning on behalf of the Civil Service Commission, and if it meets with the approval of the Committee I suggest that we call Mr. Bland and hear any suggestions the Commission may care to make to us concerning Civil Service matters.

CHARLES H. BLAND, called.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have no formal statement to make. I have been asked by my colleagues to represent the Commission at the Committee, and I hope it does not need to be said that we are only too anxious to assist the Committee in any way possible, and to place before it any *information in our possession*.

At the moment the Commission has no amendments or suggestions to place before the Committee. Since the last sessions of the Committee we have been endeavouring to carry out the suggestions and recommendations made at that time, and we feel that we have been making satisfactory progress. There is one item of unfinished business from the previous report of the committee, that in connection with the question of long term temporary civil servants, and as the Civil Service Commission was requested by the committee to secure information on this point I thought perhaps this morning you might desire to consider it, and I have the information available if that is your wish.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is that the only one? There were, I think, twenty-six recommendations. Is No. 22 the only recommendation of the committee that has not been put into effect?—A. I think generally speaking, Mr. Chevrier, action has been taken on all the other recommendations, and in that one while action has not been taken in one sense, as you will remember, the commission was directed to secure the information and present it at the next meeting of the committee.

Q. If you have no objection, I would like to take them up one by one to find out what has been done in each one of those recommendations.

Mr. POULIOT: Another recommendation that has not been complied with is the one referring to the Chairman. I understand, although I understand from what was said in the committee the other day—and so well reported by the press—that he would be superannuated shortly. I do not say that disrespectfully because I respect the Chairman very much, but thanks to the good service of the Press the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we have Mr. Bland proceed with the question of long term temporary employees?

The WITNESS: May I first quote the provisions of Section 22 of the report of the special committee of 1932, which reads as follows:

"Inasmuch as it is apparent from the evidence adduced before your committee that there are grave anomalies in respect of long term temporary and prevailing rate employees, your committee recommends that the claims of these employees be further investigated by the Civil Service Commission with a view to reporting and submitting the question to the proposed select special committee of the House of Commons on civil service matters."

As the members of the committee are aware, there have been for a number of years in the service some employees who have been called permanent temporary or long term temporaries. In the majority of cases I imagine the term of service of these employees has been at least fifteen years, and probably in some cases twenty-five to thirty years. While they have been continued in employment they have not received all the privileges accorded to permanent civil servants, and accordingly representations have been made from time to time that action should be taken to consider this question and, if advisable, to grant permanent status to those temporaries who have been there for a long period. The commission has compiled statistics and obtained data for the use of the committee in connection with it, and if it is the wish of the committee I can proceed with the general statement of the matter or, if the committee prefers, I could answer any questions that might be put respecting it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would think, Mr. Bland, if you would outline to us the problem as you see it and give us your views as to what solution there might be for the problem, then if the members of the committee raise any question that they may have in their mind, that that might be as logical a procedure as possible.

The WITNESS: The origin of the difficulty lay in the fact that under the Civil Service Act of 1919 provision was made whereby temporary employees who were continued in positions, that is, positions that would be continuous or permanent in nature, might be given permanent status either by examination or under regulations to be prepared by the Civil Service Commission and to be approved by the Governor General in Council. These regulations were prepared and a number of long term temporary employees were given permanent status under the regulations. The regulations were in force from 1920 to 1927 when they were cancelled by Council. A number of employees, however, who were entitled, or who were eligible under the regulations to be given permanent status were either not recommended by their departments for various reasons for permanency, or through sheer mischance perhaps were not acted upon by Council before the order itself was cancelled. These are the employees who are now asking for consideration, and I think it was generally felt at the last meeting of this committee that there were a number of employees in this category who might logically claim the advantages that would accrue to them if they were given permanent status. It is true that some of these employees, though not permanent at the present time, have been allowed to contribute to the superannuation fund, and hence are entitled to its benefits; but there are other benefits that they desire to have, such as the right to promotion, the right to statutory increases, leave privileges, and so on, and these employees feel there is a logical claim behind their desire to have these privileges.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The commission has no objection to the recommendation in that way?—

A. No, I think not, Mr. Chevrier.

Q. And don't you think it would be advisable that the commission should recommend that these long term temporaries should be made permanent?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. How many employees are affected?—A. Probably between three and four hundred, Mr. Laurin.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. For instance, those in the Soldiers Settlement Board.—A. Some of those would be included, Mr. Chevrier, and Public Works.

By the Chairman:

Q. In pursuance of Mr. Chevrier's question, what classes would these come in, would you outline those to the committee, and the department?—A. In the Department of National Defence, for example, there are a considerable number of such employees. The employees in question are principally caretakers of armouries, engineers, and storekeepers.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And they have been there for a number of years.—A. Yes, in some instances for many years.

Q. And most of them are returned men.—A. A great many would be.

Q. Take, for instance, the historical section of National Defence.—A. I have a note here, Mr. Chevrier, of some clerical employees; they may be in that section.

Q. I am afraid they are not, and they have been at that work for a long time.—A. I might say that this is not a complete list of every employee. It is simply a compilation, with general information for the committee, and if the committee thought it would be desirable to have a complete list I will endeavour to secure it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think it would be very desirable.

The CHAIRMAN: If you make us up a complete list, Mr. Bland, and hand it in to the clerk it will be very much appreciated.

The WITNESS: Then in the Department of Marine there are a number of employees outside Ottawa who are mainly concerned with other works, of construction or repair, such as mechanical draughtsmen, repair men, construction foremen and that type of employee who have been in the service of the Department of Marine for, I should judge, anywhere from fifteen to twenty-five years.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Are they seasonal employees?—A. No, sir, most of them are employed all year round. In the Department of Public Works there are a large number of such employees, chiefly in the classes of caretaker, cleaner, elevator operator, and stationery engineer. In the Department of Railways and Canals practically all the employees concerned are those on the staffs of the various canals.

Q. Temporary?—A. Well, for twenty years.

By the Chairman:

Q. The staffs on the canals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They would be like the regular employees?—A. Employees such as bridge men, dam-keepers, ferrymen, etc.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Most of them have had much more than ten years of service?—A. Most of them were there prior to 1919. Then in the Department of Trade and Commerce there are a number of employees on the staff of the Board of Grain Commissioners who are in the same category. As I say, this is not a complete list because I have not circularized the departments.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Would you be in a position to give us a complete list?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bland is going to give us a complete list.

The WITNESS: I will take a few days to secure it, Mr. Chairman.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Bland, I notice you do not mention the police staff of the House; for example, the Protective staff.—A. I think they too are affected; they would come in under this.

Q. You think they would be affected by this too?—A. It is quite probable, yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. I am just wondering if you have any suggestions to make?—A. The only suggestion I have, if it meets with the committee's approval, is that I think it would be advisable to secure a complete list.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you any suggestion to make, Mr. Bland, as to what lines of demarcation should be drawn in terms of years of service, or something of that kind, as to what temporaries should be included? Is it your idea that all temporaries should be blanketed in, or only those having a certain number of years of service?—A. I certainly do not think it is desirable that all temporaries should be blanketed in. I think, Mr. Chairman, I should refer the committee to the provisions of the Orders in Council that deal with this matter from 1920 to 1927.

Q. Would you give us the reference to those Orders in Council, Mr. Bland?—A. P.C. 2958.

Q. Of what year?—A. December 16th, 1920. And the cancelling Order in Council was P.C. 24/829, of May 5th, 1927.

Q. You were going to give us the substance of that enacting one when I interrupted you.—A. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The conditions laid down by that Order in Council were roughly as follows:—

1. That employees to be considered under the Order in Council must have been employed in their position prior to November 10th, 1919, that being the date on which the Civil Service Amendment Act was passed.
2. That the list should not for the time being include any temporary employees of the Soldier Settlement Board, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, or the Income Tax Office, as these departments were then operating under exemption from the Civil Service Act.

Q. The Soldier Settlement Board and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?—A. Yes, and the Income Tax Office. And the third proviso was:—

That the lists should not include any temporary employee whose age or physical condition was such as to merit his retirement from the service.

The fourth proviso was:—

That the lists should not include any male temporary employees who were of military age during the war and who were not returned soldiers or sailors, unless such employees could furnish satisfactory reasons of their failure to enlist.

These were the provisions under which cases were considered from 1920 to 1927, and, as Mr. Chevrier is aware, a great number of persons were given permanent status under them, but largely I think through misadventure a number of them were not so considered.

Q. Was it left at the discretion of the employee as to whether he should apply for permanency under that Order in Council?—A. No, I think not, Mr. Chairman. As I recall it, it was left to the department to report its employees.

Q. It is not failure on the part of the civil servant then?—A. No.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you mean to say, Mr. Bland, that there are some employees who have been temporary for around twenty years?—A. Yes, Mr. Laurin.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And, if the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission are complied with, would the recommendations have retroactive effect from the date these employees were first employed as temporaries?—A. Well, I think that would come into the picture as far as superannuation is concerned at any rate, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Yes, but what I am asking is, would such a recommendation from the Commission have a retroactive effect?—A. I think the probable answer would be that they would be regarded as having permanent status from the date of their permanent appointment, with consideration being given to any retroactive features which would be of benefit to them.

Q. Then there would be a distinction between the time of their having been made temporary and the time they will be made permanent?—A. That is a point that will have to be carefully worked out in the regulations.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Can you tell me, Mr. Bland, if these temporary employees have made previous applications to be appointed as permanent?—A. Oh, yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Coming back to what I have said to you, Mr. Bland, can you tell us what would be the recommendation of the Commission about these employees?

Mr. LAURIN: Mr. Bland has just told us that he will make a report.

The WITNESS: Not quite yet, because I do not know all the facts.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Have long term employees always been a part of the civil service or an institution of it?—A. I think perhaps it is correct to say that there has been a periodical cleaning up of these employees, and that these are the left overs from the last clean up.

Q. What I had in mind was, that possibly a condition developed during and after the war when conditions were not normal?—A. That is quite true, Mr. MacInnis. A great many employees entered the service at that time on a temporary basis.

Q. And there is no doubt that there should be no difficulty now in getting down to a basis where the number of long term temporary employees could be very materially reduced?—A. No. I think that this problem of reducing the number of long term temporary employees is possibly a solution but that, of course, is a different problem if the other is in your mind as to the number of permanent temporaries in the service as a continuing force. This cleaning up process will always hold a problem, that is, as to how many temporaries there should be as compared to the number of permanents. That is a different problem.

Q. Would not that depend on the number of positions that can be considered as temporary?—A. Yes, quite so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is, if all those long term temporaries were now taken in as permanent, nothing could stand in the way when the work decreased to such an extent that some of these would have to be released or their positions abolished; the position would be abolished and that would be all?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. It would not mean that they would remain there to the end of their days; they would become superannuated in due course or die off; but in the meantime I should hope that some arrangement could be made whereby the provisions of the superannuation act could be made retroactive upon payment in a proportionate way of the arrears of contribution, and that then they would become entitled to superannuation?—A. In a great many cases that is being done at present in connection with these temporaries; a proportion of them are at present paying into the superannuation fund, though their status has never really been determined, that is, they have been given the benefit of the doubt so far as superannuation is concerned.

Q. But that is not normal, it isn't right.—A. It isn't right.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me it might do more harm by creating temporary employees and then subsequently dispensing with their services. I think that is a condition as far as possible to be avoided. It seems to me that in the civil service when one receives a permanent appointment that person is entitled to anticipate, subject to some unforeseen condition which is beyond the contemplation of the commission at the time of his appointment, that he is going to have reasonable security of tenure of office.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Quite so.

The CHAIRMAN: And, consequently, I think it would always be necessary to have a number of temporary employees, but I think it would be possible to work out a scheme whereby subject to certain terms and conditions they could become permanent, without laying it over for a long period of years.

The WITNESS: At some later date, Mr. Chairman, I will be able to tell the committee what we have been attempting to do in the last year in that regard, that is, in connection with permanent employees who may become superfluous to one department but who may become useful in another. That is, a place may be found for them in the service where they are useful rather than retire them from the service. That was one of the recommendations of the committee.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. In order to get the best results from that employee?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Take an employee who has been temporary for over twenty years, what would the procedure be in order for that employee to be made permanent? Would he be subject to an examination?—A. Oh, no, that is not proposed.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Bland, coming back to the idea developed by Mr. Pouliot, one of the difficulties I imagine which we will have to consider if you are going to blanket in these long term temporaries to the permanent civil service, will be as to the date from which they are to become permanent, that is, if their permanency were pre-dated to the date of the original service then they would become immediately entitled to all the statutory increases which might have transpired during the time of their temporary employment?—A. I do not think it would be contemplated that a permanent appointment should be made retroactive in that sense, Mr. Chairman. That was not done before. They were made permanent from the date of the Order in Council.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. With the salary they have at the time of the appointment?—A. Yes, so that the problem did not arise. I think it would be unfortunate if it did.

By the Chairman:

Q. And am I correct in my understanding, that so far as superannuation is concerned those who were blanketed in as permanent employees—if I may make use of the word “blanketed”—were given the opportunity of securing the benefits of the Superannuation Act as from the date of their original employment by the payment of arrears of premiums, or whatever you want to call them?—A. In so far as superannuation is concerned, yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Would it give them seniority?—A. No, it makes no change as regards length of service, because in so far as seniority is concerned temporary service, as long as it is fixed, is treated the same as permanent.

Q. Therefore, their seniority would count from the date of their original employment?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Would it not be well to ask the commission to formulate a plan which, in their opinion, would meet the requirements?

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Bland has intimated he will do that and submit it to the committee at a later date.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think what the commission ought to do is to place before us the facts just as they are. I do not think that we can formulate any policy. I know what I would recommend but I do not know that it would be adopted by the Government. However, if we were placed in possession of all the facts then we might make some recommendation. As to what the government would decide, of course, I do not know.

The WITNESS: Mr. MacInnis, I do not think I said I would bring in a recommendation, in saying what I thought should be done. However, I will try and obtain all the facts and put them before the committee, and if the committee so desires I will be very glad to discuss the matter with my colleagues in the meantime and bring our suggestions before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Personally, Mr. Bland, I would like you to do that for this reason: It is all very well to have a mass of facts before this committee, but the committee no matter how many facts it has before it can never get the atmosphere surrounding the situation which must be sensed by the Civil Service Commission; and personally I should like to have the advantage of the commission's view as to what they would suggest as the scheme for solution even if for no other purpose than to know to what extent atmosphere affects it, and give us something concrete on which to bite.

The WITNESS: I will be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman. As I said before, until we have all the facts I would not like to express a definite opinion as to what should be laid down.

The CHAIRMAN: Does it meet with the approval of the committee that we should ask the Civil Service Commission, as well as submitting a memorandum of the facts, to let us have the benefit of their recommendations as to what they suggest as the solution of the problem?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Certainly.

Mr. MACINNIS: It meets with my approval very much indeed, Mr. Chairman, because I am a layman on this committee without the understanding perhaps of others who are very closely associated with the Civil Service Commission either as commissioner or the head of a department, and while I am not prepared to say that I will accept everything that they suggest yet I do not think I can come to a real opinion, one that is worth while, without having their point of view.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, Mr. Bland, I think you can take it is the wish of the committee that you ask the commission to suggest a solution as well as giving us the facts.

Mr. POULIOT: We will be very grateful to Mr. Bland if he supplies us with whatever information is available, which we will take into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite. We are not bound by it.

The WITNESS: That was my reason for not submitting a recommendation at present. I might say one thing, Mr. Chairman, in connection with it, that possibly one objection that might be urged against the matter would be the question of cost, and I think in that regard the present is a particularly desirable time in which to take action, because of the fact that statutory increases are not in vogue at the present time, nor the promotions. Consequently the cost would be practically nothing.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else that any member of the committee has in mind to ask Mr. Bland in connection with long term temporary employees?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not at present.

The CHAIRMAN: Then, Mr. Bland, I notice that in the report of the last committee, under Item 12, it was suggested:

"12. To promote economy and efficiency in engineering and mapping services, or in other services which can be centralized, your committee recommends to the Civil Service Commission that a careful study be made of such government services with a view to amalgamations thereof."

I notice some reference to it in the report of the commission filed this year, and I was wondering if there was anything other than what was in the report that you would like to add to it or bring to the attention of the committee.

The WITNESS: That is in the report of the Civil Service Commission for 1933,—

The CHAIRMAN: Would you just tell me what page you are reading from; I have not got the reference under my hand.

The WITNESS: I have it here, sir, as indicated on page 8 of the report of the commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is the page number? I would like to relate them.

The WITNESS: I do not know that I can do much more than quote the paragraph.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. In that connection there are some expenses which are necessary for the members, and it is essential to supply members with maps, and these maps can be used properly only when they are mounted?—A. Yes.

Q. And they can be mounted on linen to be hung on the wall or they can be folded up and carried easily?—A. Yes.

Q. Everybody knows the importance of this. In a country like ours every member should be supplied with all the maps that he requires and those maps are just as necessary to him as the reports of the departments?—A. Yes.

Q. And, moreover, anyone can understand that some of these reports cannot be understood properly without having these maps for the sake of comparison?—A. Our hope, Mr. Pouliot, is that connection would be that with the changes suggested we would be able to publish more and better maps, rather than fewer.

Q. Yes; but my complaint in that regard is this, that last fall I sent some maps to the Department of the Interior in order to have them mounted as I used to have before and they were returned to me with the remark that the

department was not mounting maps any more. It is a great embarrassment to us, and the service was very well done before. I do not see how members can dispense with those maps, or how they can use them properly if they are unmounted. Therefore, perhaps the recommendation of the committee has been too strictly interpreted. It is not only the federal maps that are useful to us, but the maps published by each of the provinces are very fine. There are wonderful maps published by the province of Quebec. They do not mount them in the province of Quebec—the Quebec government does not mount them—but we can secure them there and have them mounted for our own use.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you suggest we should mount them if Quebec does not?

Mr. POULIOT: Well, it is because we need them; but if you are satisfied with the way it is done—I do not know what happens in Toronto—but if they are satisfied with it, it is all right. However, I do not know how I can keep a map for any length of time without having it mounted, and the result is that I have to get two or three maps instead of having one when it is mounted.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is the question as to whether or not maps should be mounted something that comes within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Bland, or is it something under the jurisdiction of the government?—A. I think that should be under the department concerned; it does not come under our jurisdiction at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to you, Mr. Pouliot, that you will have to importune the government in the House with respect to that.

Mr. POULIOT: No. I do not wish to importune the government at all. I do not wish to take the time of the committee too long about it, but what I would like to know from Mr. Bland, if his memory serves him well, is whether the man or men who were mounting these maps in the Interior department have been discharged on account of that recommendation of the committee?

WITNESS: Oh, no, sir. I do not think that is at all so. I can make enquiries about it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I wonder if they were permanent or not?—A. I do not know who was doing it.

Q. I do not know myself?—A. I would be glad to make the enquiry.

Q. There was Mr. Lynch of the National Development Bureau, but I do not know who did the work. However, it was well done, and I would like to know if the man was a permanent employee or not?—A. I shall be glad to look into it.

Q. And if he has been discharged on account of the recommendation No. 12 of the committee.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. In this report it is stated that studies have been made regarding the co-ordination of services in various departments and reports made. Who were the reports made to?—A. To the government for consideration by council.

Q. And would it be possible for the committee to have someone appear before it—possibly yourself—and state—A. I would be glad to give you any information as to the ground covered and the recommendations made. I do not suppose I could very well produce the reports themselves. I would leave that to the discretion of the chairman. In as much as these reports have been submitted by the commission to the governor in council I suppose I could hardly table them, could I?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was going to ask where that report is and whether we could get a copy of it, because I could discuss this matter all day without it and would probably only take twenty minutes if I had the report.

The CHAIRMAN: You are speaking now of a report Mr. Bland made to council with respect to amalgamations and consolidations?

WITNESS: Surveying and mapping.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. I am referring to paragraph 2 on general economies, page 8.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it not be much simpler, as any report submitted by Mr. Bland to council is confidential not subject to production—

WITNESS: May I make it clear that they are not my reports, but they are the commission's reports.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the commission's reports. I am using your name as synonymous with the commission as you happen to be here. Would it not be simpler for our purpose to ask Mr. Bland if he would be good enough to intimate to the commission that this committee desires that the commission make a report to it in connection with matters of amalgamations and consolidations?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not want the commission to make another report if it has been made. If the commission cannot produce the report here, could you, Mr. Chairman, ask that the government or the proper authority produce that report; otherwise, we cannot discuss it. The commission has made recommendations "for the co-ordination or amalgamation of the services which the commission believes will tend to greater efficiency and economy." Now, how can we intelligently discuss that unless we have the report. I could take up days on this subject; if I had the report it might limit me to taking about twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Where were you reading from?

Mr. MACINNIS: The last two lines.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The last two lines of paragraph 2.

The CHAIRMAN: I can only say that as a matter of procedure and jurisdiction I must of necessity rule that this committee has no power to require either the Civil Service commission or the government to make available to this committee a report submitted to the government by the Civil Service commission, but we can ask the Civil Service commission to make a report to this committee; and it seems to me that it is a very simple thing to do—why not do it?

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, on this—

Mr. LAURIN: I entirely agree with the Chairman; why not ask the commission to make a report?

WITNESS: I shall be glad to bring information before the committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: At that time I will ask whoever produces it whether it is the same report that was made to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all right. I am not so sure that it is all right, but let us not discuss it. I spoke too quickly. I said it was all right before you asked it. I did not say it was all right with respect to the commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Under that provision I shall say nothing until I get it.

Mr. MACINNIS: What is important to the committee as far as we are concerned is the extent to which that report has been put into effect.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think it has been acted upon at all.

WITNESS: I do not know how far it has been acted upon.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Bland cannot say what consideration has been given to the report, because it is in the hands of the Government. The commission did its part by reporting.

Mr. MACINNIS: Have you a co-ordinating official—if I may use the term—in your department whose duty is to survey departments or to get the information before you are able to make those reports?

WITNESS: Yes; a number of such officials.

Mr. MACINNIS: I presume that they would know to what extent the report was put into effect—or the recommendations in the report?

WITNESS: Generally speaking, I think there has been some progress made in the matter. I am, obviously, unable to say what consideration the Government has given to the report, because I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Does this meet with the approval of the committee: we will ask Mr. Bland that the Civil Service Commission should be requested to make a report to the committee in pursuance of the matters suggested under the heading "general economies" on page 8 of the report of the Civil Service Commission for the year 1933?

Mr. CHEVRIER: With reference to amalgamation and co-ordination.

The CHAIRMAN: With reference to amalgamation and co-ordination of services. Does that meet with the approval of the committee?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The surveying and mapping services, just to put it in the way the section reads.

The CHAIRMAN: I notice that other matters are referred to such as legal services and medical services. Do you wish to confine it to surveying and mapping services?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It was because the recommendation was made that way.

The CHAIRMAN: We will confine it to surveying and mapping services for the time being.

(Carried.)

Now, is there anything else you like to have Mr. Bland discuss this morning?

Mr. CHEVRIER: We made a report in our last committee recommending under some twenty-five different heads certain things, and we come this year to see what has been done with those recommendations. It is rather late now, but it might be well if we had a synopsis from the Civil Service Commission, say, with reference to paragraph 3 of the report, for instance, showing what has been done; then, with regard to paragraph 4, showing what has been done, and we will take the residue—whatever the commission has done in compliance with the report. I have no interest in going over it.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. The former committee's report is divisible into three sections, the first section containing ten recommendations. It is not divided in fact, but it really is divisible. The first ten recommendations were included in statutory amendments to the Civil Service Act. There can be no advantage in having Mr. Bland deal with those.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Have the amendments been introduced into this copy of the data that has been furnished?—Yes, I think so.

Q. All those statutory recommendations that have been made?—A. On the first ten.

The CHAIRMAN: All down to ten are out. Would you like Mr. Bland to prepare a resumé of No. 11—

Mr. CHEVRIER: To the end.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, 26, 27, 28 and 29 have nothing to do with the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Say to 26.

The CHAIRMAN: Suppose we say from 11 to 25 inclusive. Does that meet with the approval of the committee?

Mr. POULIOT: Why not put in 26?

The CHAIRMAN: Because the Civil Service Commission can have nothing to do with it and have nothing to say about it. Excuse me, 25 and 26 were also incorporated in the enactment.

WITNESS: 25 was.

The CHAIRMAN: 25 is out.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Just indicate it so we will have a clear statement, and as to 26 we can say what we like. I have no knowledge that it is not under jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN: Suppose we ask Mr. Bland to prepare a resumé from 11 to 24 inclusive; I think that covers everything you want, does it not, Mr. Chevrier?

WITNESS: May I ask if the committee wants a written resumé?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think it would be shorter if you had a written resumé.

WITNESS: I will be glad to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you be good enough to do that with reference to 11 to 24 inclusive of the previous committee's report? Twenty-four is merely a statement of fact. The Professional Institute of Canada made representations and we did not see fit to make recommendations. Eleven to 23 inclusive, Mr. Bland.

Mr. POULIOT: No. I would like to have 24, if you have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I have none, but what can we do about it?

Mr. POULIOT: Well, if it is not harmful it is just as well to deal with it.

The CHAIRMAN: How can the man possibly do anything about it? Twenty-four says, "representations were made to your committee"—that is, to the Civil Service committee—"on behalf of the Professional Institute of the Civil Service of Canada. It would appear that the subject matter of some of these representations have been considered by the Beatty Commission. They are sub-judice. Your committee does not, therefore, see fit to make any recommendations thereto."

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right. It is all right for you to read it, but I do not ask you to answer it. The answer should come from the Civil Service Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: No, pardon me. At the moment this committee is discussing the question as to what we will or will not ask Mr. Bland to supply to this committee, and, as a member of this committee, I, the same as any other member, have a perfect right to discuss what we are going to ask Mr. Bland to supply. I am opposed to your suggestion of asking anybody to answer something which he is not in a position to answer. The committee made no recommendation, therefore there is nothing that Mr. Bland or anybody else could do about it.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take such a high tone, but I am here to get the information, and if Mr. Bland has some information to give let him give it, and if he has none he will say "we have no information about it."

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the best way.

Mr. POULIOT: I often receive this answer in the House. I do not know why Mr. Bland could not give information to us if he has something to say to the committee, and if he has nothing to say he will say, "I have nothing to say". The chairman said that we are all on the same level. I am glad, and I do not wish to be disagreeable to anybody here. I am here to do my duty and get all the information you have from the Commission along this line. I do not wish to insist upon it, but my language is firm and definite.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I move that we ask for information from 11 to 26 inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved, gentlemen, that Mr. Bland be requested to provide the committee with a written statement showing what action, if any, has been taken with respect to the recommendations of the previous Civil Service committee contained in clauses numbered 11 to 26 inclusive of the report of the previous committee. Is there any discussion?

Mr. MACINNIS: I do not know of any discussion that is necessary. I think the position taken by the chairman was well taken. We were asking Mr. Bland to make a statement on recommendations made by the last committee. Now, here is a matter on which the committee did not make a recommendation and we are still asking Mr. Bland to report on that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: He can say "I don't know".

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right; but, Mr. MacInnis, the recommendations were made on No. 26, and I wonder if you will take the same stand about 26 when the recommendation was made by the committee.

Mr. MACINNIS: I have no objection to it, but I think it could be very well left out.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the reason I objected to it was because with regard to 24 no recommendation was made. Therefore, I do not want to see the committee put in the absurd position of asking the Civil Service Commission to make a report as to whether or not any action was taken with respect to something upon which we recommended there should be no action taken.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then they cannot report.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. Each one has his turn. Section 25 of that report was acted upon in the House, and a statutory enactment was made; therefore, there is nothing in respect of which the Commission can report relative thereto. Twenty-six was a recommendation which could in no way be dealt with by the Commission; it dealt with the disposition of the Commission itself; and could only be acted upon by the House of Commons and the government, and, in pursuance of the recommendation of this committee it was acted upon by the government. True, the action taken by the government may be considered by some to have been acted upon only in part but, nevertheless, it was acted upon, and, whether the government did right or wrong in respect to the action it took cannot possibly serve this committee in asking the Civil Service Commission—one of whom is affected by the very clause—to make some report to this committee with respect to an action taken by the government. That is why I objected to the proceeding and suggested that in lieu hereof clauses 11 to 23 only be included.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I support Mr. Chevrier's motion for this reason, that numer 24 says, "your committee does not therefore see fit to make any recommendation relative thereto." I will tell the committee why I insist upon having an answer to this. I want to know if anything has been done in that regard notwithstanding the fact that the committee has made no recommendation, and that is why I want an answer. The committee has made no recommendation; that is right; but that report is dated May 10, 1932. I want to know if, apart from the fact that the committee made no recommendation, action was taken nevertheless, and I will not repeat what has been said.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There is my motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

(Motion defeated.)

I am ready to receive a motion requesting Mr. Bland to supply a written memorandum with respect to items 11 to 23 inclusive.

Mr. MACINNIS: I move that the Civil Service commission be requested to prepare a written memorandum for the committee as to what action, if any, has

been taken with respect to the recommendations of previous Civil Service committee contained in items 11 to 23 inclusive of the previous committee's report.

(Carried.)

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other matters you would like to ask Mr. Bland about this morning?

I might say, Mr. Bland, that those of us who were members of the previous Civil Service committee were particularly gratified to find that item 27 of our previous report had been given some consideration, and on their behalf as well as my own, I desire to congratulate you on your appointment to the Civil Service commission and to express the view of those members of the committee who still adhere to the opinion which they expressed in the previous report; and we sincerely trust you may long continue to be the incumbent of the office.

Mr. POULIOT: I was not then a member of the committee, but I fully concur in what has been said.

The WITNESS: I thank the members of the committee very much indeed.

The CHAIRMAN: Does it meet with the approval of the members that we should take up Bill No. 4 at our next meeting if it has been referred to this committee?

Mr. POULIOT: Surely.

The committee adjourned to meet on Wednesday, March 14.

APPENDIX—DOCUMENTS FILED

Filed by C. H. Bland

(Copy)

P.C. 24/829

CERTIFIED to be a true copy of a Minute of a Meeting of the Treasury Board, approved by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the 5th day of May 1927.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Board had under consideration the following memorandum from the Civil Service Commission, submitted by the Honourable the Secretary of State:—

“On the 16th day of December, 1920, an Order in Council (P.C. 2958) was passed giving authority to His Excellency the Governor General in Council to grant permanent status to certain temporary employees who could conform to the regulations set forth therein, and on the 22nd day of October, 1921, an Order in Council (P.C. 3895) was passed amending certain provisions of the aforesaid Order in Council of the 16th December, 1920. Under the authority of these two Orders in Council approximately 3,871 employees have been granted permanent status, viz., O.A.S. 1,168, Male Civilians 1,430, Female Civilians 1,273.

“The Civil Service Commission observes that one of the regulations in the said Orders in Council provides that a temporary employee to be eligible for permanent status, shall have been occupying a permanent position or positions continuously since prior to the 10th day of November, 1919; consequently, any employee eligible thereunder has been so eligible for nearly five years.

“The Civil Service Commission further observes that the said Order in Council of the 16th December, 1920, has now been in force for three and a half years and that ample time has been given for the application of its provisions to all temporary employees entitled to benefit thereby and the Commission submits that it is not in the public interest to allow this special authority to grant permanent status other than as provided in the Civil Service Act, to continue indefinitely.

“The Civil Service Commission therefore recommends that the said Orders in Council of the 16th December, 1920 (P.C. 2958) and 22nd October, 1921 (P.C. 3895) be rescinded as from the 1st day of November, 1924.”

The Board concur in the above report and recommendation, and submit the same for favourable consideration, to take effect, however, from the date hereof.

(Sgd.) E. J. LEMAIRE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

(Copy)

P.C. 2958

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE AT OTTAWA .

THURSDAY, the sixteenth day of December, 1920.

PRESENT

HIS EXCELLENCY THE DEPUTY GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL:

WHEREAS the Civil Service Commission reports that by section 11 (2) of the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1919, it is provided that “No temporary

employee shall be given a permanent position as a result of classification except upon examination under the provisions of this Act, or without examination under the regulations made by the Commission and approved by the Governor in Council ”;

THEREFORE His Excellency the Deputy Governor General in Council, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, is pleased to instruct and doth hereby instruct and direct the Civil Service Commission to submit to His Excellency in Council lists showing the temporary employees who are now occupying positions regarded by the Civil Service Commission and by the Department concerned as of a permanent nature, whose services are certified as satisfactory by the Department and approved as such by the Commission and who conform to the following regulations:—

1. Such employees shall have been assigned to the said positions prior to November 10, 1919, being the date on which the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1919, became law.
2. Such lists shall not include for the present, any temporary employee of the Soldier Settlement Board, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment or the Income Tax Office, inasmuch as these departments are operating under exemption from the Civil Service Act in so far as their temporary employees are concerned.
3. Such lists shall not include any temporary employee whose age or physical condition is such as to merit his retirement from the Service.
4. Such lists shall not include any male temporary employee who was of military age during the recent war and who is not a returned soldier or sailor, as defined by the Civil Service Act, 1918, unless such employee can furnish reasons satisfactory to the department and to the Commission of his failure to enlist for such service in the war.

HIS EXCELLENCY IN COUNCIL is further pleased to order that such of the above employees as may be granted permanent status by the Governor in Council shall have their rates of pay determined as follows:—

Group I.—The rate of pay for employees receiving rates of compensation less than the minimum of the classes in which their respective positions are placed shall be advanced to the minimum rate of the class effective April 1, 1919, or, if the employee entered the Service since that date, the date of such entry.

Group II.—The rate of pay for employees receiving rates of compensation which are either at the minimum or maximum or intermediate between these rates for the classes in which their respective positions are placed shall be at the rate which the employee is then receiving, or if such be not an established classification rate, then the next higher classification rate shall be paid, effective April 1, 1919, or, if the employee has entered the service since that date, the date of such entry. If an employee in this group has received an increase since April 1, 1919, the corresponding classification rate shall be effective only from the date of such increase.

Group III.—The rate of pay for employees receiving rates of compensation more than the maximum of the classes in which their respective positions are placed shall be the maximum of the said class effective from the date the permanent classification of the position has been confirmed by the Civil Service Commission under these Regulations.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

SESSION 1934

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 2

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1934

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1934

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1934

WITNESSES:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.

L. Gerin, Chief, Debates Translation Branch, House of Commons.

P. de Martigny (alias Pierre Lefort).

OTTAWA

J. O. PATENAUDE

PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY

1934

ORDERS OF REFERENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, February 16, 1934.

Resolved,—That a Select Special Committee of this House be appointed, to consist of seven members, to be hereinafter named, to inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, with instructions to inquire into and report concerning the repeal or amendment of any of the provisions of the said Act or the substitution therefor or addition thereto of other provisions, as the committee may deem advisable, with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses and to report from time to time to this House.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

FRIDAY, February 23, 1934.

Ordered,—That Messrs. Bowman, Chevrier, Ernst, Laurin, Lawson, MacInnis, and Pouliot do constitute the Select Special Committee of this House pursuant to the motion adopted on the 16th day of February, 1934, to inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, etc.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

THURSDAY, March 1, 1934.

Ordered,—That the said Committee have leave to print its day to day Proceedings and Evidence, 500 copies in the English and 200 copies in the French language. That the said Committee have leave to sit while the House is sitting.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

THURSDAY, March 8, 1934.

Ordered,—That the following Bill be referred to the said Committee: Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Bureau of Translations.

Attest.

ARTHUR BEAUCHESNE,
Clerk of the House.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson in the chair.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, Bowman, MacInnis, Pouliot, and Chevrier.

The committee took under consideration Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Bureau of Translations.

Mr. Chevrier presented, to the Chairman, a demand in writing, that he do cause a summons to issue to Paul de Martigny alias Pierre Lefort, a parliamentary correspondent of the Montreal daily newspaper *La Presse*, to appear before this committee at the next meeting thereof to give evidence touching his knowledge of matters at issue in the matter of Bill No. 4, as in his opinion the evidence to be obtained from said witness is material and important.

Mr. Pouliot presented a like demand as to the attendance of Canon Emile Chartier, vice-rector of the University of Montreal.

After discussion on the question raised as to whether the said several demands were in order and as to the propriety of calling the said witnesses, the Chairman ruled the matter to be premature as the question of the competency of the committee to summon witnesses should first be determined.

The question of the competency of the committee to summon witnesses then came under discussion, when the Chairman ruled that the committee is not empowered to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses under the Order of the House referring to the committee the said Bill.

Mr. MacInnis moved that the House be asked to empower the committee to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses in respect to the Order of the House referring to the committee Bill No. 4.

The motion being put, was debated at length, and the debate continuing, the committee adjourned at 12.30 a.m. till Thursday, March 15, at 10.45 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, March 15, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 10.45 a.m., Mr. Lawson in the Chair.

Members present, Messrs. Lawson, Bowman, MacInnis, Laurin, Pouliot and Chevrier.

The committee again took under consideration Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Bureau of Translations.

The Chairman informed the committee that he had re-considered his ruling made at the previous meeting, to the effect that the authority vested in the committee by Order of Reference, dated February 16, 1934, to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses, was confined to the subject matter of the said Order, viz.: the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act etc. and that such authority did not extend to the Order referring to the committee, Bill No. 4.

That he had consulted the Clerk of the House who expressed the opinion that the said ruling put too narrow a construction on the Order of Reference. That in deference to such opinion he now withdraws the said ruling and rules that the committee has power to send for persons, records and papers and to examine witnesses, under the Order referring Bill No. 4, to the committee.

Consideration was then given to the request of Mr. Chevrier that Mr. Paul de Martigny be summoned as a witness for the next meeting.

On motion of Mr. MacInnis, Mr. de Martigny was ordered to be summoned for Wednesday, March 21 at 11 a.m.

The request made by Mr. Pouliot to have Canon Emile Chartier summoned was taken under consideration and stands as a notice of motion for later consideration.

The committee decided to call as witnesses, in addition to Mr. de Martigny, Messrs. L. Gerin, Chief of Debates Translation Branch and Hector Carbonneau, Chief of General Translations Branch, House of Commons.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, March 21, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Wednesday, March 21, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present, Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, MacInnis, Pouliot, Chevrier and Bowman.

The committee again took under consideration Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Bureau of Translations.

Mr. Paul de Martigny (alias Pierre Lefort), Special Reporter for La Presse newspaper, was called and examined.

Witness discharged.

Mr. L. GERIN, Chief, Debates Translation Branch of the House of Commons, was called, examined and released.

Mr. C. W. BLAND, Civil Service Commissioner was called and examined with respect to a statement prepared by him of translators in the public service.

Statement filed.

Witness released.

It was agreed that the following witnesses be called for the next meeting, namely; C. W. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, Hector Carbonneau, Chief, General Translation Branch, O. Chaput, Head Translator, Bureau of Statistics, and possibly other witnesses to be named by Mr. Chevrier.

Mr. Pouliot gave notice that he withdrew his application to have Canon Chartier called as witness.

Mr. Laurin gave notice that on consideration of the cognate clause of the Bill he would move an amendment that: "All translators or other employees transferred to the Bureau as herein or by regulations or orders in council provided, shall be paid at rates not less than the rates such persons were receiving prior to their transfer to the bureau.

The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m. till Wednesday, March 28, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

March 21, 1934.

The select special committee on the Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Just before the conclusion of the last sitting, gentlemen, some member of the committee intimated that he would like to have witnesses brought here to outline where the translators were located, their numbers and so forth. I am not sure whether one of these gentlemen that we asked to come is a witness for that purpose or not, but it occurred to me after the committee adjourned that I could probably get a very full and complete statement of the situation from Mr. Bland of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHEVRIER: As to what?

The CHAIRMAN: What translators were employed, in what departments they were located what their salaries were and so forth. So I asked Mr. Bland if he would make out such a statement and he did. If it meets with the approval of the committee that later on you would like to have Mr. Bland come and give us that as a sort of foundation on which we might build or start, I will have him do so.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have that statement here?

The CHAIRMAN: It was delivered to me last night or early this morning. I have not looked at it yet. There should be copies made for each member of the committee; and I will have Mr. Bland come in some time during the morning and tell us about it.

Mr. POULIOT: Are the salaries mentioned?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: And the branches in which they are located?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes; it gives the number of translators, who they are and all about them. Now, I think we were to have Mr. Paul de Martigny this morning. Is Mr. de Martigny here?

Mr. DE MARTIGNY called.

Mr. POULIOT: With the permission of the members of the committee, I should like to make this observation before Mr. de Martigny gives his evidence. I should like to refer to an article which appears in the newspaper *L'Illustration*, written by Edgar Boutet, who is secretary to an executive in the Post Office department. I mentioned the matter in the house. It seems that any newspaperman whether he belongs to the civil service or not, is free to discuss the stand of the members here; but I understand that no man is allowed to falsify our statements or what we say here.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. POULIOT: What I have to complain about is an article which appeared in *L'Illustration*, Montreal, in which the stand taken by Mr. Lapointe, Mr. Mercier and myself is falsified or given an erroneous interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN: What has that to do with this committee?

Mr. POULIOT: All I have to say is, I want to give to Mr. Boutet the solemn undertaking that he will be called to the bar of the house if he makes the same mistake again.

The CHAIRMAN: Do not impose that on us.

Mr. POULIOT: I wanted that clearly understood.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you want to swear Mr. de Martigny?

Mr. MACINNIS: I think it would be better, but of course I am not insisting on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us get on with the witness.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are Mr. Paul de Martigny?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you received a summons, I believe, to appear before this committee?—A. Yes.

Q. You are here in response to the summons?—A. Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: I think you are the member who desired the gentleman's presence, Mr. Chevrier?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. de Martigny, what is your present occupation?—A. Well, as I take it, I am a witness.

Q. That is not your occupation, that is just on occasions?—A. Well then, I am a newspaper reporter.

Q. For what paper?—A. La Presse.

Mr. LAURIN: Would you rather speak in French?

The WITNESS: I think I can toddle along in English.

The CHAIRMAN: You will make it easier for some of us if you do.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If any difficulty arises, the witness can always say so, and we shall be glad to give him an opportunity to correct any misinterpretation.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You are, as I understand it, a representative of the newspaper La Presse?

—A. No, I am not engaged as the representative, only a special reporter. I am a special envoy of La Presse.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. What do you mean by "special envoy"?—A. Well, I am placed by the chief editor at the disposal of the resident correspondent to write special stories and to supplement him as much as possible when the occasion arises.

Q. It is left to your judgment?—A. Yes, under the special direction of the chief editor, and the director of La Presse.

Q. You are free to choose the speeches upon which you write?—A. Well—

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, excuse me. I do not want to be put in the position of interfering with the examination, but this is hardly germane to Bill No. 14, or any matter before this committee.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: We have no concern with what this man's occupation is or is not.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Chairman, these were only ordinary questions, but I am through with that. Will you please define what you mean by an expert in translation?—A. Well, I suppose it is a man who knows his business.

Q. What are the qualifications of a good translator?

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Pouliot. You are asking this man for his opinion. I think as a lawyer you will agree with me that opinion evidence is never admissible except from some one who has been previously qualified as an expert.

Mr. POULIOT: He was called an expert by the Secretary of State in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: That does not prove a thing to me. The Secretary of State may be entirely mistaken, in addition to which I have not before me as evidence anything said by anybody in the House of Commons. If you want opinion evidence from this gentleman, it is first necessary to qualify him as an expert, otherwise his evidence is not admissible.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. de Martigny, are you the gentleman that was referred to in the speech in the house by the Hon. Secretary of State when he said he had obtained the opinion of an eminent bilingual man and ably qualified in translations. I am not going into the speech from the throne, as I said long ago I was through with that?—A. Do you mean Pierre Lefort, yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You are Pierre Lefort?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you a perfect knowledge of both official languages, the English and French languages?—A. Well, I would not say as much of my knowledge of French, although I have studied quite a number of years.

Q. What is your age?—A. My age is a very delicate question. I think I am rather on the good side of the sixties, and I intend to remain on the good side for a number of years.

Q. Where did you learn French?—A. Well, if you want to know, many places; but as an example, in the French Presbyterian faculty of McGill University in Montreal, where I followed my courses in philosophy, French literature, and where I attended quite a number of lectures on the oriental languages.

Q. Oriental languages?—A. Rev. Coussirat was my reverend professor.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What oriental languages please?—A. The origin of the oriental languages, going into the origin of them, let us say, Hindu and Hebrew.

Q. Any Spanish?—A. That is another question, but I think that I would rather have a practical knowledge of it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Did you study Japanese and Chinese?—A. No.

Q. Did you study French after you left McGill?—A. Well, to make a long story short, I may say that I am about the only French reporter who belongs to the Paris press and I still own my card from both the chief of Police of Montreal, and the prefect of police, Paris, and when I take the trouble of writing stories sometimes they are printed in Paris.

Q. The chief of police of Paris and other cities has nothing to do with Bill No. 4.—A. So I see.

Q. And therefore we will leave the chief out and ask you what papers you were the correspondent for when you were in Paris?—A. I was not correspondent, I was reporter.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but surely that has nothing to do with this bill. Let us get down to business.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I asked you if you studied French after having left the Presbyterian faculty at McGill?—A. Yes, certainly I did.

Q. How did you study it?—A. In college with professors of the university of Montreal. I followed in Paris the course of study as outlined by the school of political science in economics.

Q. Have you degrees from those schools?—A. No, I have not, because I had to earn my living. I could not follow them sufficiently regularly enough to obtain my diploma.

Q. You followed those courses as an amateur?—A. No, not as an amateur, but I could not pass my examinations or sit for them. I passed certain examinations of the faculty of law, Laval university, but I left, I had to.

Q. Where did you study English?—A. Well, it would be a long story. I remember at the age of 17, my father told me that it was a shame that I could not express myself in English; so he chose a professor for me, who was an Englishman, of London. Now, the first thing he told me was that I was speaking French like a little pig, that I should rather learn my French first as I spoke patois, and afterwards English.

Q. What do you mean by saying "speaking patois". You were brought up speaking patois?—A. Well of course, I was brought up somewhere around Quebec.

Q. Was patois the language of your family?—A. No, but patois was rather spoken where I was brought up, like it is in some parts of Montreal.

Mr. POULIOT: Here is a witness who insults the French Canadian.

WITNESS: No, I am not.

Mr. POULIOT: I resent that very much. It is a shame for a man who is a French Canadian to make a statement like that in regard to the French Canadian language. I am through with him. That is enough of that.

The CHAIRMAN: If this continues, I warn you now, I am going to rule the whole business out. We are going to stick to Bill No. 4 and the members of this committee might as well get that clearly in their minds now. If you are going to abuse the latitude that I am allowing then I will curtail the latitude. Let us get down to Bill No. 4. This man has admitted he is not an expert in the translation of French into English, and English into French. That is the ground on which one of the members of the committee asked that he be called. If you propose to show that he is an expert, please go ahead and do it. If you do not, then let us ask him something that has some relation to a clause of the bill.

Mr. POULIOT: I am satisfied to have learned that the witness spoke patois until he was 17.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Have you been a translator somewhere?—A. Yes.

Q. Where?—A. At the "Information" in Paris, first.

Q. What did you translate?—A. English into French. My duties called for me to be there from four to eight, and I was given to the services of the consulates of English language. That was my department.

Q. How long did you do that?—A. For four years, about.

Q. After that, did you do any translation?—A. I did some here in Ottawa.

Q. How long ago did you stop translating before coming to Ottawa?—A. Well let us say— before coming to Ottawa—?

Q. How long did you stop translating for that agency before coming to Ottawa?—A. Well, I came to Montreal and for a certain number of years I was in the newspaper game in Montreal, and I of course was translating every day, more or less, as we had to.

Q. That is not an answer to my question. I asked you how many years passed between the time you stopped translating for that agency and coming to Ottawa?—A. It was long ago. Let us say twenty years.

Q. After which you did some translating in Ottawa?—A. After which I did some translation in Montreal. I was a translator for the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank of Canada, and the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

Q. How long did you do that?—A. Well, for four years, I guess.

Q. You worked for the three banks for four years?—A. Yes; I was at the time serving on the *La Presse* as a reporter.

Q. And it was a side job?—A. A side job.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You remained there four years?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. When did you come to Ottawa as a translator?—A. I came to Ottawa when I came back from Paris. I think it is four years ago.

Q. So, you went to Paris?—A. I went to Paris many a time, because I made my career both in Montreal and Paris alternatively, depending on the chances I had to do better either place.

Q. You did not learn the Parisian French?—A. Of course I did learn it. I never said I was speaking patois, but my professor told me I was speaking it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Why didn't you stick to Canadian French?

The CHAIRMAN: You do not need to answer that question. I am going to rule out that question.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. At what time did you come to Ottawa, what year?—A. Four years ago.

Q. Four years ago?—A. A little more than four years. Let us say 26 or 27 months, something like that.

Q. Twenty-seven months?—A. Fifty months, about, or fifty-one.

Q. In 1929?—A. No, I think it was in 1930.

Q. In the spring?—A. No.

Q. In the winter?—A. In the winter, yes.

Q. In the winter of 1929-1930?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. July 1930?—A. After.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Were you a candidate at a Civil Service examination?

The CHAIRMAN: You do not need to answer that.

Mr. BOWMAN: What is this witness being called for?

Mr. POULIOT: For being a translator.

Mr. BOWMAN: Is it to assist this committee or attack his credibility. It is a strange performance.

The CHAIRMAN: I allowed this witness to be called because it was alleged by you, Mr. Pouliot, that this man was an expert in translation, and being such an expert you desired to obtain his views as to the efficacy or otherwise of translation, or in respect of some matter related to this bill. On that basis and that only the committee passed that he should be called as a witness.

Mr. POULIOT: May I submit something to you, without asking a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Most assuredly.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you very frankly, Mr. Chairman, why I put that question. The reason is that the witness never passed an examination of the Civil Service Commission.

WITNESS: Oh, my—

Mr. POULIOT: He was a candidate first for the Debates branch, and he came 45th in a list of 48 candidates. I am not to be interrupted by the witness. I am not speaking to the witness now, I am speaking to the Chairman, and am explaining to you, Mr. Chairman, the reason for my question. When I said that he was an expert witness, I was using the expression that the Secretary of State used in the house. My belief is always to accept a statement until the contrary is proved. Up until now I have asked no unnecessary questions of the witness. The only thing I have asked him is to corroborate this statement made by the Secretary of State in the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN: No, you have not asked him that.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. My very question to the witness was this: "Did you pass an examination of the Civil Service Commission?" If he is an expert he should have been one of the first candidates to be successful in the examination.

The CHAIRMAN: Now Mr. Pouliot, our position in this matter is as follows: as a committee we are not in the least bit interested in what may have been said by the Secretary of State or anybody else in the House of Commons. That is a matter for the House of Commons. So far as we are concerned, we are considering Bill No. 4. That disposes of that matter.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Did I understand you to say this gentleman tried a Civil Service examination for translators and ranked 45?

Mr. POULIOT: Out of 48, or something like that; nearer the tail than the head.

The CHAIRMAN: I think on your own statement you have shown clearly that this gentleman cannot possibly be an expert in translation.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a statement that I make. It is an explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept your explanation. You bring a witness here and you attempt to qualify him as an expert, but your method of attempt is to destroy the fact that he is an expert. In view of that, unless some member of the committee has some questions to ask, I rule he is not an expert.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just one more remark to add to what I have said, and that is this, that there was not the least bit of an insinuation of any kind in my question to the witness. I simply asked him if he had followed the same course as thousands of similar employees who have passed examinations before the Civil Service Commission. I have given some explanation to you as to some current rumours which are widespread, but I will not insist any more on that. On behalf of the witness I resent very much the fact that you have taken that

interpretation from the question I asked. I did not make any statement to him. I just said what was reported about town and in the whole province of Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: We pay no attention to reports.

Mr. POULIOT: We can base questions on reports in order to know if they are true or not. If a gentleman has successfully passed an examination of the Civil Service Commission, it would be laudatory for him to answer.

WITNESS: I was successful when I was a candidate for translator in the Debates Branch of the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN: If the question is referable to the subject matter before this committee, no one will have any objection. Let us get on.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Are you still a translator?—A. No.

Q. When did you leave?—A. Let us say a little more than two years ago.

Q. For what reason?—A. I was told there was no more money to pay.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. You do not need to answer that question. Now, please do not answer until I get a chance to tell you whether it is admissible or not.

Mr. POULIOT: Did you leave of your own volition?

The CHAIRMAN: You do not need to answer that question.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right, I am through.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I understand that at one time you were an employee of the translation branch of the House of Commons?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you there any more in that capacity?—A. No.

Q. How long were you a translator in the house?—A. Two years.

Q. Can you say why you left?

The CHAIRMAN: You do not need to answer that question. I will tell you why. You two gentlemen called this witness on the ground that you wanted to establish he is an expert. Your whole examination is only to destroy the fact that he is.

Mr. POULIOT: No.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to make this committee made a monkey of.

Mr. BOWMAN: To show he is not qualified to give evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: You may just as well make up your minds now you are not going to use this committee for the purpose of carrying on some spat between members of this committee and the Secretary of State in the House of Commons.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think I have shown great respect and diffidence to you in the position which the chairmanship of this committee entitles you to; but if you have, Mr. Chairman, anything in the back of your head of that kind that I am here to ventilate any spat—I wish you had not used that word. I don't think it is a word you should have used.

The CHAIRMAN: I will withdraw it. Disagreement.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have no disagreement in that way at all.

The CHAIRMAN: If you refer to page 1547 of Hansard at the bottom of the page, you will find this:—

Mr. Chevrier: The two questions which I now desire to direct to the hon. Minister are, which of the two reports, that of Hansard or this press report, correctly reports what the hon. minister said—

You are referring to something that the witness wrote.

At that moment. Did the hon. Minister in any manner solicit any opinion from these two experts, as is alleged by Pierre Lefort in this article?

Hon. C. H. Cahan (Secretary of State): My answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that I will look at the article if the hon. member will send me a copy, and I will compare it with what I stated. Regarding the latter question, as to whether I solicited opinions from any person, that is a matter about which the hon. gentleman has no right to ask and I certainly shall not answer it. As a Minister of the Crown I think that if I wish to know whether a translation made by a translator of this house is correct or not, I have a perfect right to ask the opinion of any gentleman I choose.

Mr. Chevrier: Then I shall summon these people and find out from them.

And I say you are not going to use this committee as long as I am Chairman for the purpose you indicated in Hansard.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, I think that is a very injudicious statement to make to say that you will not let us do anything in this committee as long as you are chairman. One may do anything here which may be agreeable to the majority of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, they may not. We may as well know our rights right now. There are certain things you can do as a member of the committee and there are certain things I can do as chairman.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have just one thing to say, and it is that you destroy the witness much more by refusing to allow him to answer our questions than we do by asking the questions.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a matter of any concern to the committee or to the House. I have no intention of injuring the gentleman or doing him an injustice in any way.

Mr. POULIOT: You may not have the intention to do so but it is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry if that is the result, but we must proceed along well defined lines in this committee. Are there any other questions to ask this witness?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, I did ask Mr. Lefort to come here because he is an expert on translation.

The CHAIRMAN: Because you thought he was.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am sorry, but he is not, from what I have seen.

Q. Mr. Lefort, did you at any time write any articles about the reorganization of the translators in the Civil Service?

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Lefort, that is not an admissible question, you need not answer.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You have written a number of articles, Mr. Lefort, as to how the translation bureaux should be organized?

The CHAIRMAN: You need not answer that question, Mr. Lefort.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then, Mr. Chairman, what can be asked of this witness?

The CHAIRMAN: Nothing until you qualify him as an expert, and you have destroyed his qualifications as an expert.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Wait a moment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: You yourself said this morning, just a moment ago, that you yourself were now satisfied that he is not an expert.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then we will let him hang where he stands. I do not want anything more from the witness; he is not an expert. That is all I wanted to show, that he was not an expert.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, are there any other questions?

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to take this opportunity to tell the committee that I will not insist on summoning Canon Chartier of Montreal, because I would not do him the injustice of comparing him to the witness who has just been heard.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentlemen?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not from me.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lefort. I am very sorry that you should be subjected to comment by some members of the committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not know why the chairman should say that. You have no right to say that at all.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not within my jurisdiction to pass any comment upon it. You are discharged, Mr. Lefort.

Mr. POULIOT: We make no comment, we have passed judgment.

The CHAIRMAN: Another witness that was asked for this morning gentlemen, was Mr. Hector Carbonneau. However, I see Mr. Bland here. Is it the wish of the committee that we hear Mr. Bland at this time.

Mr. MACINNIS: I move that we hear Mr. Bland.

Witness retired.

CHARLES H. BLAND, recalled.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bland, at my request you were good enough to prepare a memorandum showing the number of translators in the service, the departments to which they were allocated and so forth. Have you any copies of that which you delivered to me yesterday.

The WITNESS: I can have copies prepared immediately, Mr. Chairman. I have only one copy here.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Bland will outline for us the translators in the service, the departments they are connected with and so forth. There is one copy of the data with the clerk of the committee but other copies will be prepared and handed to each member of the committee at as early a date as possible. Would you just please outline the situation so us, Mr. Bland.

The WITNESS: I am sorry Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I did not know the members of the committee desired to have copies of this memorandum or I could have had a copy for each member, but I will have copies prepared immediately for the members of the committee.

I prepared a brief outline of the distribution of the translators in the public service, it being understood that this list does not include officials who may be classified as clerks or stenographers and who may perform part time translation duties or who may assist translators in translation duties.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You mean only those who are qualified as translators, whose duty it is to translate.—A. I include in this list, Mr. Pouliot, only those who are classified as translators and who are employed full time.

Q. How many are there?—A. There are 84 classified as translators.

Q. And what is their total salary.

The CHAIRMAN: How would it be if we let Mr. Bland go ahead with his statement.

The WITNESS: I did not total their salary but I will do it for you. I have taken first, the Parliamentary translators, that is, the House of Commons and the Senate. In the Hansard or Debates Branch there is a chief translator, an assistant chief, and there are fourteen Parliamentary translators. In the General Branch there is a chief translator and there are ten Parliamentary translators. In the Law Branch there is a chief translator and there are two parliamentary translators. In the Senate there is a chief translator, a head translator, and one gentleman employed on a temporary basis who is paid on a daily rate. That includes the translators in what I call the parliamentary staffs. Then there are the departmental translators in the following departments:—

In the Department of Agriculture there is a head translator; there are also two senior translators and four translators. For the information of the committee, if it is of any assistance to them, I am maintaining the same order for these officials. I am putting the chief first and then ranking them down for the purpose of classification; they are in the same order for each department.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You said something about the House of Commons, and the Senate, I think.—A. Yes, Mr. Chevrier.

Q. I just want to find out in those two Houses how many translators there are.—A. There are sixteen in the Debates branch of the House of Commons; eleven in the General Branch; three in the Law Branch, and three in the Senate.

Q. Mr. Bland, in the Senate are there not only two?—A. Well, I qualified the third in the Senate by saying he was employed temporarily on a daily basis, in translation work. Only two are classified as translators.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What is the difference between a chief translator and a head translator?—A. Well, this list that I shall hand in to the committee, Mr. MacInnis, shows the salaries for each of these grades. If you care to have me give them I can give them. The chief and a head translator may vary in various departements, that is, there is a different salary. I can give you the salary in each case if you so desire.

Q. I am not so much concerned about the salary. I was just wondering what the duties are for a chief.—A. I might quote the salary for the three chief officials in the House of Commons, \$3,600 to \$4,140 in each case, that is, for the chief in each of the three branches of the House of Commons. In the Senate the chief translators salary range is higher, \$3,780 to \$4,620.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The principal translators are chief, the only difference is in the salary?—A. In some cases a department contains only a principal translator. The word "chief", or "principal" or "head" Mr. Pouliot, I think, is somewhat misleading. The higher grading may be called chief translator; then we come down to head translator, then principal translator.

Q. The title is in accordance with the salary?—A. Yes. They are graded upwards, you see.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is, the salary is in accordance with the classification?—A. They are all in accordance with each other, I think, as much as possible.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And at times the principal is alone?—A. You see, he is not a principal in relation to the other members of the staff; he is a principal particularly in relation to other grades in the translator service.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. I understand the salary of the chief translator in the Senate is higher than that of the chief in the House of Commons. Is it because the work is more important there and they would have more work to do.—A. Without making further inquiry into that, I am afraid I will have to leave the question till later. I am not clear on that myself.

Mr. POULIOT: I think Mr. Laurin's question is a very good one.

The WITNESS: I will be glad to secure that information for the committee.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You will look that up Mr. Bland??—A. Certainly Mr. Laurin.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, outside of the House of Commons are the translators submitted to civil service examination.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All translators?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And are the blue book translators submitted to civil service examination?—A. Well, may I just make certain that I understand that question correctly, Mr. Pouliot. All these translators with the possible exception of the translator in a branch of the service that is exempt from the Civil Service Act, such as the Income Tax branch, are subject to the provisions of the Act and enter by means of competitive examination; but I would not want to make that statement indicating that every one of these translators has entered through competitive examination. Some of them may have been there before—

Q. Yes, some of them may have passed the examination and some of them may have been employed by a vote of the House?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Bland, do you think that it is wise to appoint a translator into one of these technical positions without a very severe and most exacting test as to his capabilities of filling that position?—A. I think the best method of selecting the best available translator is by means of a severe technical examination.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I agree with you.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, all those 84 translators are subject to the observance of the Civil Service Act?—A. With the possible exception of—

Q. Those others who are appointed by a vote of the House?—A. With the possible exception that there may be some in the exempt portions of the service.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have no questions to ask Mr. Bland this morning. There may be some questions that I would like to ask at a future meeting of the committee, and I think Mr. Bland will always be at the disposition of the committee.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Mr. Bland, of the 84 translators which you mentioned this morning, can you tell us how many of them have come into the service through competitive examination.—A. I can secure that information for you. I cannot tell you off-hand, Mr. MacInnis.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentlemen, of Mr. Bland, in connection with his statement?

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, do you wish to take the statement as read?

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I thought you had gone through it.

The WITNESS: It would suit me quite well, Mr. Chairman, if the committee should take it as read.

Mr. BOWMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be far better if we had Mr. Bland's statement. We would then know what we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we will have copies of Mr. Bland's statement before the committee at our next meeting.

Q. Mr. Bland, this committee asked you for a lot of other information in connection with other matters. However, we will not trouble you until we get through with this translation bill. We want to dispose of this first and then we will get you to come back. I think the other witness asked for to-day was Mr. Hector Carbonneau.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am in the hands of the committee, but I have suggested Mr. Gerin, you will remember. He is the head of the debates.

The CHAIRMAN: You want Mr. Gerin first.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, I will be satisfied to-day with Mr. Gerin.

Witness retired.

HECTOR GERIN, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Gerin, I understand you are chief of the debates translation branch of the House of Commons' staff of translators.—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I understand that you have a statement, Mr. Gerin.—A. Well, I have a brief statement which I prepared for the sake of precision, if I may be allowed to read it.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will be glad to have it.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. For how many years have you been chief translator?—A. Since 1916.

Q. Were you the head translator in 1916? Have you been the head translator since then?—A. Chief translator in 1916.

Q. Were you there before then?—A. Oh, yes, since 1904.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You are the president of the Royal Society?—A. It happens so.

Mr. CHEVRIFR: I thought if the witness would give his statement that probably afterwards if we care to ask questions we might, but I would like to reserve my right to read any statement that is presented so that at the next or subsequent meeting after having read the statement that the witness might be recalled, because I find it very difficult to take notes and then examine a witness after he has read a long statement.

The CHAIRMAN: We will try to make all witnesses available at any time it suits the convenience of the committee.

The WITNESS: While the session lasts, our ordinary day's work is about as follows:—

1. *Unrevised Edition.* By 7 a.m. our messenger is at the Printing Bureau, St. Patrick Street, to take delivery of a printed copy of the previous day's Hansard (Unrevised edition), which he takes to our offices in the Central Block.

He then distributes through the various offices allotted to the translators of debates copies of the said issue of Hansard, each with a slip attached bearing the name of the translator to whom it is destined, together with the numbers of the pages assigned to him for translation in the course of the day. He is thus in a position to sit down to work at once.

By the time each one of the eleven translators has completed the translation of the first page falling to his lot, it is forwarded either direct or through a messenger to one of two revisers, who go over the copy and make corrections deemed necessary. Following on this preliminary revision, the copy is handed over to the head reviser for further scrutiny and lastly to the chief translator for final examination before it is put into the printer's hands. The chief makes it a point invariably not to leave for lunch until a first delivery of eleven pages of Hansard has been put into the hands of the head messenger for prompt delivery by auto to the King's Printer.

The remainder on the unrevised Hansard for the same previous day's sitting goes through the same process of translation and revision until it reaches the printing presses, so that within twenty four hours or so of the issuing of the unrevised (mainly English) edition, an unrevised French edition is available at the distribution office of the House of Commons.

The proof correcting is done at the Printing Bureau by men specially employed there; but the care taken in the revising done by us of the copy before sending it to the printer greatly simplifies the work by dispensing with numerous corrections which otherwise would have to be done on the galley proof or page form.

11. *Revised edition:* Distinct from the unrevised edition, there is a revised edition of the French Hansard, which differs from it inasmuch as it includes corrections of typographical errors to be found in the printed unrevised French edition; also members' corrections as shown on the sheets of the unrevised edition; also some further occasional corrections in the French text suggested by a further examination and comparison of the original text and translation, for instance when separates of important speeches are ordered for widespread distribution throughout the country. We had two four hour speeches to go over, 40 page speeches, one by the Leader of the Opposition and one by the Prime Minister, and another not quite so long to arrange by the hon. member for Bow River.

The main features of our work are: first, a daily translation from English into French of the contents of the previous day's unrevised Hansard. Second, a bi-weekly translation from French into English of any utterances or other material contained in said official report. Third, the translation and insertion of all members' corrections of the report of their speeches to be included in the revised edition of Hansard. Fourth, a further and final revision of our transla-

tion of all speeches, with special emphasis laid on those for which a separate issue has been ordered for widespread distribution. Fifth, the preparation of a detailed index, a table of contents, to be inserted in a separate volume.

Most of this work, practically the whole of it, must be done at a high rate of speed, and under pressure. We translators of the House of Commons, and more particularly those of Hansard, have been represented by some as men enjoying exceptional advantages in the way of salary and leisure. I may be allowed to point out a few facts to dispel such an erroneous impression.

Our remuneration is on the same basis, as, on a par with, if not somewhat on a general lower plane, than that of the official reporters of debates, who, I aver, do most excellent work, but may I submit not any greater in volume nor higher in quality than our own.

And should we enquire outside the service of the House of Commons, we would find, for instance, that the St. Lawrence pilots stationed in Montreal, in many cases draw larger pay and enjoy more leisure than we do ourselves. Unless it is assumed that literary work is to be rated lower than purely practical attainments, I fail to see any ground on which to justify any such discrimination in the treatment dealt out.

By the Chairman:

Q. You realize that there is nothing in this bill that proposes to reduce the translators' salaries or interfere with the translators' salaries?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Gerin was just having a little bit of humour on the side.

The WITNESS: I am not discussing the bill just now.

The CHAIRMAN: What I am interested in is your point of view as chief translator. Go on with your statement, and I shall ask you some questions later.

The WITNESS: I am just saying that our salaries are not abnormal, that we are just earning what a pilot earns, and I suppose their attainments should not be higher than ours.

The CHAIRMAN: I might say just for your general information, every member of this committee with the exception of one, spent some months some time ago dealing with civil service matters, and none of us have the opinion that the civil servants are too highly paid.

Mr. POULIOT: I was not a member of the committee at that time, but I share the view of the Chairman and all the members of the committee in that respect.

The WITNESS: On the whole, it seems desirable, that present conditions be maintained, if at all possible, in order to ensure a continuous recruiting of men capable of doing justice to our representative men as evidenced by their utterances and pronouncements in the House of Commons. Otherwise, the efficiency of this important public service will be made to suffer.

Mr. LAURIN: It is my intention to move the following resolution: That in the event of translators being transferred from their present positions to a central bureau, their salaries shall remain at the same scale as heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind if we treat that as a notice of motion, and you can move the formal motion later on?

Mr. LAURIN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am very much interested in what Mr. Gerin has said. With the leave of the committee I should like to get some information as to the working of the machinery by which this translation is done. If I have that permission, I should like to proceed somewhat in this manner.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Suppose there is a speech made in the House of Commons, or suppose I were to make a speech in the house, what would be the next step in the process of translation? After I have spoken, I go up to the Debates office and I am allowed to make certain grammatical corrections, and then I understand that—
—A. That would be for the revised edition.

Q. No, before it goes down. After I have done that, I understand that the English version goes to the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes. We get our copy printed from the Printing Bureau.

Q. You get your copy from the Printing Bureau the next morning?—A. Between seven and eight in the morning.

Q. You get it in the Hansard shape?—A. Yes.

Q. You get it on the sheets, but they are not bound?—A. An advance copy.

Q. What do you do then?—A. Well, that is distributed to the staff. Each man gets one page, and he is obliged to deliver that page before noon, say, or one o'clock at the latest, and then the rest is distributed, and he turns in the translation.

Q. Suppose you got my speech that had nine columns of material, which would amount to about four or five pages in forty minutes. What do you do with that? Do you give one page out?—A. One page at a time.

Q. Every man gets one page at a time?—A. One page at a time.

Q. You have eleven translators?—A. Eleven just now. We used to have twelve, but they cut us down to eleven.

Q. Each one gets one page of my speech?—A. Yes, one page.

Q. And then what would they do?—A. Well they translate it and then it is sent to a reviser.

Q. Why?—A. It is sent to one reviser and then to a second reviser for further scrutiny, and then it is sent to the Printing Bureau right away.

Q. Now, when you send it—A. We have several deliveries that way each day.

Q. What I am trying to get at is, once you have translated it on a sheet of paper, the corrections are made by the translator and then they go to the revising officer?—A. To one of the revisers and a second reviser.

Q. And to a second reviser?—A. Yes.

Q. And corrections are made?—A. Then, to the chief.

Q. That is how it is done?—A. Yes.

Q. And the corrections are made on that particular sheet?—A. Yes, the unrevised French edition.

Q. All the corrections are made on that sheet and then it goes to the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. When it goes to the Printing Bureau, is that sheet just about as complete as it can be with reference to any corrections?—A. Well, of course, there is a revised edition which comes later. All the corrections of members are not on that yet.

Q. Then it goes to the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Printing Bureau sets it out according to the sheet?—A. Yes.

Q. I do not know Mr. Chairman, whether the witness can say what happens at the Printing Bureau; but at the Printing Bureau it is put into type?—A. Yes.

Q. And then I suppose up there they have somebody that revises the draft of the sheets?—A. Yes, they have their reviser.

Q. Then it comes back in the ordinary Hansard?—A. Unrevised. Then, we are called on later to put in the corrections of members that make any alterations suitably.

Q. Now then, when it comes back—that is the unrevised edition—you send to the members a copy of what they have said?—A. No, we do not, unless they ask for it. If they ask especially for it, we do, because it would delay the work.

Q. Then I have the right to go over that and to make certain grammatical changes?—A. You are most welcome. All members are welcome to come to us and help us out in our difficulties.

Q. When the unrevised edition comes back, a member has the right to go over it to correct any grammatical error or change the syntax construction?—A. Yes. We just follow the English copy that is sent to us from the central office, from the office of the Editor of Debates.

Q. Suppose after I received my unrevised edition, I change the sentence around without disturbing the sense—I understand according to the rules I cannot change the sense of it—in order to give it a better grammatical construction. Suppose, instead of using one word I use two or three words?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, I may disturb the whole paragraph, and by disturbing the whole paragraph, in typesetting, I may disturb the whole column?—A. Yes.

Q. It then goes to the Printing Bureau, but what happens because of that?—A. Of course, we do not see to that at all; we do not see to that.

Q. It may very well happen?—A. We fix the copy for the printer. We never go to the Printing Bureau or interfere with their work in any way.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You do not correct the proofs?—A. No, we do not correct the proofs.

Q. That is corrected at the Printing Bureau?—A. The unrevised is read over. We have a man who reads the unrevised and makes the necessary alterations.

Q. When your copy goes to the Printing Bureau, you do not look for the corrections at the Printing Bureau?—A. No, as long as they follow the copy. They have a corrector there for typographical errors. They have no right to change the matter.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You have been here a number of years?—A. Yes.

Q. How many years?—A. Since 1904, I think.

Q. In the translation branch?—A. Hansard, yes. Before that I was in the Department of Agriculture.

Q. How long have you been in the position you now occupy as chief?—A. Since 1916.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, my difficulty is this, and I may just as well say it now: that I do not know what this bill asks. I am trying to find out if there is any way of improving the present system and if it can be improved, in what way. I should like to follow out that question.

The CHAIRMAN: Nobody is interfering with you.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I understand, owing to your position, you cannot be critical of any measure which the government brings down. It is not your function to criticize any matter of this kind that any government may bring down. Mr. Gerin, as an employee of the Crown, you must do your work according to the directions that are given to you, but at the same time—

The CHAIRMAN: I think it only fair to say to you, Mr. Gerin, so far as this committee is concerned, we shall be very glad to have your views and opinions as to whether or not you think the establishment of a bureau of translation is beneficial to your service or detrimental to your service, or anything of that kind. Do not hesitate to give us your opinion.

Mr. MACINNIS: He is in the position of a protected witness.

The CHAIRMAN: We will give him every protection.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What I was trying to get at, Mr. Gerin was this: Have you any suggestions to make as to improving the present system, if it can be improved?—A. Well, I think it is giving fairly good results. Anything can be improved, I suppose. It is giving fairly good results now. For myself I would be in favour of maintaining the present system as it is.

Q. You would be in favour of keeping the system as it is?—A. Yes, with minor improvements that are not dependent on our goodwill, to do the best we can, and I think we are doing fairly well in the circumstances.

Mr. POULIOT: You are doing very well.

The WITNESS: Thank you.

Mr. LAURIN: That is your personal opinion?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Have you given any thought, Mr. Gerin, to the improvements in the arrangement of the translators' work?—A. No, I have no suggestions to make.

Q. Have you given any thought to the matter of improvement?—A. Oh my, yes. I have been at that for so many years that I have always thought of finding some way to improve, some kind of improvement.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. What do you mean by "minor improvements"?—A. "Minor"? Did I say minor?

Q. Yes, minor improvements to be made.—A. I do not remember having said "minor". Did I say that?

The CHAIRMAN: I think so. It is immaterial. Did you not mean that?

The WITNESS: No.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no harm done.

The WITNESS: I do not remember exactly how it was. You can always improve matters. There is no doubt you can always improve matters but sometimes it is not dependent on us. We are only a wheel within a wheel and so we have to work as best we can, taking into account the other elements.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not know whether I am quite within the four corners of the bill, but Mr. Chairman I understand that this would be a bureau of translation that would probably take away from the various departments the translators where they are now situated. There is nothing in the bill that says that, but there is an atmosphere as to that. Now, may I ask this. Suppose that the translators of the house were to be taken away from their present situations and put under a superintendent outside of the jurisdiction of the house—I do not know whether the bill means that, but some of us think that is what it means.

The CHAIRMAN: If you let me interrupt you to say this. I do not think there is any question that to some extent that is what the bill means. The bill provides

- (1) That there is to be a translation bureau;
- (2) That a minister of the crown is to be responsible for it;
- (3) That it is to have a superintendent;
- (4) That all of its employees come under the Civil Service Act.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Now, if that be so, Mr. Gerin, if the translators of the House of Commons, particularly the debates with which you are acquainted, are taken away from under the jurisdiction of the house and placed under the jurisdiction of a super-

intendent in some bureau, can you say whether that will constitute an improvement in the manner of translations and the quality of translations or whether it will not?—A. That would depend on what kind of superintendent it would be. Of course, if he let us largely alone, I think it would be all right. If he interfered with our work, it would be rather difficult; it would make things harder for us, for our work is special, of course.

Q. I think I get your angle. If the translating branch of the debates was put into this great big bureau, and had but one superintendent to look after all of the diversified interests that would find themselves in that bureau, would it constitute an improvement in the translation of the debates?—A. Well, I do not think so, but I may be mistaken. He might be a man of superior attainments and may give us some pretty good ideas, but I do not see how it would work. We are getting along pretty well, much satisfied with it now, and we are improving all the time.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any suggestion of that, Mr. Gerin. If you will look at section 5 you will see it provides, “(1) an officer to be called the superintendent of the bureau for translations shall be appointed under the Civil Service Act, who shall hold office during pleasure, and whose duties shall be to supervise and control the bureau under the direction of the Minister.” There is no suggestion anywhere in the bill, as I understand it, and I have read it several times, that there will not be general translators in the different branches, and so forth.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That may be so, but my difficulty is this: It is not stated in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: You can never state a matter of administration in a bill. All you can do is make statutory provision, and I assume that the Civil Service Commission will do its best to try to work out something that gives the most efficient service.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I cannot discuss that with the witness.

The CHAIRMAN: You are at liberty to discuss it but I am merely pointing out that I do not think that is under contemplation.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions, gentlemen.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. If there is, in accordance with the provisions of the bill, a general superintendent, would it then be necessary to have a chief translator of the debates branch of the House of Commons as well?—A. Well, I should think so.

Q. Yes?—A. Unless they work out a plan—

Q. To have general control?—A. We are doing real team work and the chief translator is the chief of that field. He must be there because it is quick work.

Q. There must be a leader?—A. There must be a decision given promptly several times a day.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Mr. Gerin, you have been there since 1904?—A. In that office, yes. Before that I was in the Department of Agriculture.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Translation?—A. No, I was secretary to the commission.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Now, have you any power to go to another department and ask them to go ahead with the work?—A. To help.

Q. To go ahead with the work?—A. Oh no

Q. Could you go to them and say "we are in a hurry and we want this translation to be made"?—A. No.

Q. Do you have any meetings between the heads of departments? Have you had any meetings between the heads of each department since 1904, for the securing of co-operation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not think that if you have a superintendent to meet all the heads of departments in an endeavour to secure co-operation in order to have the work done that it will be in the interests of the government?—A. Well, I don't know how we would go about it.

Q. Well, if you had a very clever superintendent.—A. Well, he must be very clever.

Mr. POULIOT: Who is he to be.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Well, we will wait and see. Do you not think that if you had the co-operation of each department, if he asked you to co-operate, the work would be done much faster than before?—A. Of course, I cannot give an answer to a simple hypothesis. I don't know how it would be arranged.

Q. But you have just said you have never had any meetings of heads of the departments since 1904.—A. No. Well, we consult with them, for instance, if there is a question of law we go up to the chief law translator.

Q. But in connection with the work of translating you never had any meetings?—A. No, sir.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Gerin, I would like to get one or two matters cleared up. Did I understand you to say that in your branch, that is, the debates translation branch, there was yourself and eleven other translators.—A. Yes, more than that, because we take over revision.

Q. Mr. Bland has brought us in a list here this morning which shows that you are the chief translator.—A. Yes.

Q. And that Mr. Gascon is the assistant chief.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that in addition there are fourteen Parliamentary translators, is that correct.—A. Well, I suppose.

Q. Let me give you the names and see if you agree with this, Mr. Gerin.

Q. Mr. Baril.—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Beaubien?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Bernard?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Chevassu?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Cinq-Mars?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. D'Astous?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Daviault?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Dumont?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Fauteux?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Keliher?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Girard?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Chagnon?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Schenck?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Vallieres?—A. Yes.

Q. They are all there, are they?—A. They are all there.

By the Chairman:

Q. Then there are fourteen. Then something else I wanted to ask you, Mr. Gerin: During the session what hours do you have to work.—A. Myself personally.

Q. Yourself personally Mr. Gerin.—A. Well, I get there about half-past nine, nine or half-past nine.

Q. Well, we will say nine. And what time are you free at night or in the afternoon, when do you get free.—A. A little after one sometimes.

Q. Sometimes after one o'clock in the day time.—A. Between one and half-past because I have to make that delivery before I go to lunch; and sometimes it is a little longer.

Q. When you say one or half-past you mean one o'clock at noon.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then do you go back after that again.—A. Yes, half an hour or three-quarters of an hour later I go back.

Q. And how long are you on duty then.—A. Well, from my return until seven. Generally I go to supper at seven.

Q. Seven p.m.—A. P.M., yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. And then do you go back again.—A. Oh, yes, I go back.

By the Chairman:

Q. That is four hours in the morning, and then up until seven o'clock would be another five, and then you go back at night again?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what time do you generally go back at night?—A. Generally until eleven. I stay there until eleven.

Q. And how long do you take for dinner, an hour or an hour and a half?—A. Oh, no, I cannot afford to take an hour and a half. It is about three-quarters of an hour or half an hour.

Q. And then you go back and stay till when, eleven?—A. I stay till eleven, sometimes after.

Q. Supposing we take eight to twelve, that is another four hours?—A. Yes, you might say that.

Q. That is, roughly speaking about thirteen hours a day that you are putting in during a session.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that would be for five days a week.—A. Yes. Well then, I have to stay Saturdays generally.

Q. Well, on Saturdays you would not have to stay till eleven or twelve at night.—A. Well, it depends on what I have left. You see, the Friday delivery comes to us on Saturday morning and we have a little more leisure to send that out. We generally send that out on Sunday evening. The messenger comes for it, so we have a little more leisure and we give a little more time, it permits of better work.

Q. Would I be doing full justice to the hours that you put in if I take thirteen hours a day for six days a week.—A. Well, I have never counted them. I am regulated by my work. I don't count it every day.

Q. What I am trying to do is to get at facts.—A. Yes.

Q. Because my view is that you gentlemen have to work long hours, just as many members of parliament do, during the session.—A. I don't complain at all.

Q. I am not suggesting that.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Are you married.—A. Yes, sir, but I don't bring my wife to Ottawa because I would not have time to look at her.

By the Chairman:

Q. Now, Mr. Gerin, if I take thirteen hours a day for six days a week am I doing justice to you.—A. Well, I never counted them you know. I don't care, it is just as well to work as to worry.

Q. Well, I will have to form my own opinion. That is about seventy-eight hours a week during the session.—A. It is understood that we have a hard pull during sessions. Everyone of them pull just as hard as they can.

Q. Do your other translators have to put in as long hours as you?—A. Not quite, but I think they work more strenuously during the hours they are there.

Q. At the moment I am only interested in the number of hours. Would they put in approximately the same number of hours as you during the session?—A. Well, they arrive a little earlier generally. Generally, they arrive about eight o'clock. In fact some of them arrive before that.

Q. And do they get away earlier or not?—A. Well, yes. Sometimes they have to return after supper but not always.

Q. Would I be doing them full justice if I calculate the number of hours that they work on the same basis that I have yours?—A. Well, no, it is not quite so long. Perhaps I am slower at work.

Q. You think they would not work longer hours than you in any event?—A. Oh, no, my hours are longer. That is why I don't bring my family here; I wouldn't have time to look at them.

Q. Mr. Gerin, if you will just please answer my questions we will get along much more rapidly. When the session is not on what hours do you have to put in then?—A. When the session—

Q. Is not in progress, during the adjournments, between the sessions.—A. Oh well, we have our recess then, we are away.

Q. I see.—A. After a while we complete Hansard and then we go. That is the other side of it.

Q. Once the session is over, Mr. Gerin, what work have you still to do in completing Hansard? You say you complete Hansard and then you go?—A. Yes. I have to look after the index, you see. We have men making the index and things like that and I have to look after that, some day the balance of the copy, if there is any back.

Q. On the average, how many weeks after the close of the session are you still on duty before you are free to go?—A. Oh, about a week or ten days.

Q. About a week or ten days.—A. But then they send work to wherever I am.

Q. Let me stay with the session for a minute. And would that also apply to your translators, that they too are free after a week or ten days after the adjournment of the session.—A. Oh, yes, less than that, because they are the first to go.

Q. Now then you say that between sessions "they send me work". Who do you mean by "them"? Who sends you work?—A. Who sends work.

Q. Work during the adjournment between sessions.—A. Well, for instance, Mr. Vallieres who looks after the English edition will send me his work to revise if it is not all revised.

Q. But what has Mr. Vallieres to do after the session is over.—A. Mr. Vallieres is our English translator.

Q. Yes?—A. And as he hadn't enough to keep him quite as busy as the others we gave him some little extra work.

Q. Well, is Mr. Vallieres here during the whole of the year, is he on duty during the whole calendar year?—A. He is free after a while too.

Q. Well then, may I take it that with the exception of Mr. Vallieres and yourself, your other translators are free from duty from a week to ten days after the session until the convening of the next session.—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Mr. Vallieres though still has some odd duties to perform between sessions, and you in turn have some odd duties to perform between session?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, just one other thing. When you outlined to us, Mr. Gerin, the work as done you indicated that a translator translates, we will say, from English into French?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will call him an original translator in order to distinguish. Then this work goes to a revising translator does it.—A. Yes.

Q. And the revising translator revises the work of the original translator?—A. Yes.

Q. And then does that translation pass on from the revising translator to you.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And do you read over every translation that is made?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Every one.—A. Yes, unless I am too short of time, but that does not happen very often because we have to deliver at fixed hours.

Q. Frankly, I was thinking that it would not be possible for you to read everything.—A. Well, it is hard work for the chief but he has the whole responsibility of the office.

Q. That may be true, but now am I to understand that you take every speech that is made in English and you read that line by line with the translation into French.—A. Yes, I read the translation. I have the English copy beside me and I have his translation and I read it over. If anything catches my eye or gives me a suspicion that there may be a mistake I refer to the text.

Q. But you actually do attempt to read every translation as revised yourself.—A. Yes, sir, I do. I don't do it with all the attention perhaps that would be necessary, but I do the best I can.

Q. I appreciate that, but I think probably I would describe it correctly if I said you edited the translation.—A. Well, that is it. I consider myself as such, as the editor of the French Debates.

Q. Assuming, Mr. Gerin—and you are not bound to answer this question unless you want to—that when the bureau of translation is established there is no interference with the hours of labour of the translators in your branch, nor with their salaries, then is there any objection you can see to the establishment of a bureau.—A. No, sir, if we are left as we are now.

Q. Yes, so that I may take it that if there are objections to the establishment of a translation bureau those objections come down to a question of hours of labour and salary.—A. Well yes, I suppose.

Q. Well, but I do not want you to suppose. I want to get this definite. Just take your time. I say if your translators—and by “your” I mean the translators in your branch and yourself—are not interfered with either as to hours of labour or as to pay, then is there any objection to the establishment of all translators of the government into one bureau under one head.—A. Well, there is just this: If the head chief interfered with our work it might make difficulties.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. But if he co-operated with you?—A. There are many ways of co-operating, sir. We have always been accustomed to manage our work for ourselves. It would all depend on the kind of a man he was, a man of intelligence and tact then I suppose it would be all right.

By the Chairman:

Q. Then, Mr. Gerin, may I take it this way, you are giving me the objections which you see to the establishment of a bureau, and, may I take it that you see three objections or possible objections, one, the interference with the hours and conditions of work now established for the translators; two, possible interference with salaries; and three, possible interference by the new superintendent in the method or means adopted for accomplishing of translations?—A. Yes.

Q. Would that summarize the situation?—A. Well, I suppose it would, yes. I don't see anything else.

Q. You cannot see anything else at the moment?—A. The only thing is, matters were going on pretty well we thought as they are now, and we do not wish to change the status or administration of the office.

Q. Well, I do not want to go into a discussion of that because it is obvious that other people have a different viewpoint?—A. It is just to be perfectly frank that I said that.

The CHAIRMAN: Quite so. I think that covers what I want.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. If what the Chairman has suggested happened, namely, that there would be that bureau over which there would be one superintendent, would the work be done as efficiently as it is being done now?—A. Well, if you left us alone I think it would. We are doing pretty good work, but it all depends on the man who is appointed.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Gerin, might I ask that if we have a superintendent would it be possible for him to do efficiently the work you do and to supervise at the same time the translation in all the other branches of the government and the House of Commons and the Senate?—A. Oh, it will all depend on the kind of man he will be. There may be supermen.

Q. Yes, but just an ordinary efficient man, would it be possible for him to do the work that you do now, and at the same time supervise the translation in all the other branches of the government, the House of Commons and the Senate?—A. Well, that general supervision, I would be afraid of it for my part.

The CHAIRMAN: Surely that assumes he is going to be an administrative official.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is just my difficulty, there is nothing in the bill that gives that guarantee.

Mr. MACINNIS: There is nothing in the bill that the superintendent is going to do the work that Mr. Gerin is doing either.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. In view of what has been said, Mr. Gerin, according to your own good judgment you consider there is no necessity now for a general superintendent to supervise your work and the work of the division?—A. I don't see it, but perhaps I am conceited. We were getting along pretty well.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. You are speaking now for the particular department in which you are engaged?—A. Yes.

Q. You don't know anything about the other departments?—A. Of course ours is a special department. We are in constant contact with the Members of Parliament and we have to take their views very often and modify sometimes our regulations to a certain extent as long as it does not interfere with the work.

Q. Just what do you mean by that, Mr. Gerin, that you have to modify your views because of Members of Parliament?—A. Well, the members have the right to make corrections on their copy and we have to insert them in the copy.

Q. Well, the corrections are limited, are they not, to just corrections? They are not allowed to change the wording in the unrevised?—A. No, and they don't do it, I don't think they do it generally.

Q. Well, do they do it at all.—A. Well, it may happen.

Q. I have been very scrupulous in the matter myself, and, of course, if other members are taking a certain amount of latitude I don't see why I should not.—
A. We do not make the corrections. The corrections are made on the English copy.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And you have also to correct the proofs of speeches.—A. No, we don't correct any proofs. That is done by the Printing Bureau. We thought it was a better way to correct the manuscripts of the translation just to avoid printers corrections.

Q. And to save money.—A. That is why I read over the whole translation before sending it out.

Q. In order to save expense.—A. Well, yes, to save useless corrections or corrections that will be made after the revision itself. We try to do that because we notice that Members care a great deal more for the unrevised edition than for the revised, and so we make the unrevised as perfect as we can. That is why I thought it would be a good plan to have the chief read over the whole translation before sending it out.

Mr. POULIOT: We all highly admire your great sense of duty, Mr. Gerin, and we thank you very much for your illuminating evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentleman? Thank you Mr. Gerin. Gentlemen, are there any witnesses you would like to hear at the next session of the committee other than Mr. Bland before we proceed to a clause by clause consideration of the bill. Somebody said they would like to have Mr. Carbonneau here.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be curious but that is my difficulty, I cannot get the proper angle on this as to how it is going to work out. I would like Mr. Carbonneau to give the committee his views, and it might be well to have some one from the administrative branches, probably some of the chiefs of the other translation bureaus, and probably some of the Deputy Ministers.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Carbonneau is the chief of the translation branch.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And then there may be someone from the senate. I do not know whether the senate people want to appear but, in my opinion, we ought to have someone from the administrative branches to express their views.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, who else would you like.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Just at the moment, Mr. Chairman, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Carbonneau is chief of the general translation branch, you would like to have Mr. Carbonneau appear before the committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes. And then if you wish, Mr. Chairman, when we meet again—

The CHAIRMAN: That will be next Wednesday.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then would it meet with the approval of the committee if say to-morrow I suggested to you the names of those I would like to have called.

The CHAIRMAN: Give them to the clerk.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will let you know.

The CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Bland will be here ready to go on next Wednesday.

The committee adjourned at 1 p.m. to meet again Wednesday, March 28th, at 11 o'clock, a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 3

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1934

WITNESSES:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.

H. Carbonneau, Chief, General Translation Branch.

O. Chaput, Head Translator, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, MacInnis, Chevrier, Pouliot and Ernst.

The committee again took under consideration Bill No. 4, An Act respecting the Bureau of Translations.

Mr. C. W. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, was in attendance and produced and filed a Statement indicating the action taken by the Commission with respect to the recommendations contained in the Committee Report of 1932.

The chairman informed the committee that the clerk, at his request, had prepared a comparative statement of the annual number of working hours (days) of Debates Translators and Departmental Civil Servants working under the civil service regulations.

Members of the committee were supplied with copies of this statement.

Mr. Hector Carbonneau, Chief, General Translation Branch, House of Commons, was called, examined and retired.

Mr. O. Chaput, Head Translator, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, was called, examined and discharged.

The slate of witnesses to be called for the next meeting was left in abeyance.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, April 11, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MARCH 28, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, at our last sitting I think you all received copies of a memorandum made up by Mr. Bland as to translators in the public service, showing the different departments to which they were allocated; and at the conclusion of last sitting I asked Mr. Fraser, the clerk, to make a computation of the number of days worked by the translators on Hansard, taking the last five sessions, and taking as the basis of the hours worked the figures computed from the evidence of Mr. Gerin, the chief translator of the House of Commons. I asked Mr. Fraser also to make a comparative computation of the working hours of other civil servants, and I have had it put into type-written form, and it has been distributed for the convenience of members of the committee.

This morning the committee asked to have available as witnesses, Mr. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, Mr. Carbonneau and Mr. Chaput. Would you like to hear from Mr. Bland first?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not particularly, except at a later date we will be furnished with that report that we asked for—the report of last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Which one was that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: You remember we asked for a report as to what had been done—

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. Mr. Bland, I think you were going to prepare for the committee a memorandum or report as to which, if any, of the recommendations of the last Civil Service committee had been carried out; is that available now?

Mr. BLAND: That is available now.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If it could be filed now we would have an opportunity to look over it.

Mr. BLAND: I have copies prepared.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think there was another point about the long time temporaries. There was to be some report on that.

Mr. BLAND: That is practically ready. We have reports from the various departments and we were summarizing them.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not available yet?

Mr. BLAND: Not quite.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else, Mr. Chevrier?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: All these will be available after the Easter recess. I think, Mr. Bland, that that is all we need trouble you for this morning. Just let the clerk have the memorandum.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Before we proceed with regard to this memorandum which has just been filed, I suppose it is all right, but I do not know how these

computations were made. I am quite prepared to let the memorandum be filed, but I would not want it to be taken as admitting—

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a document that is being filed and put in the evidence; it just arises out of the questions and answers of Mr. Gerin. I thought it would be a convenience to the members of the committee if the computation was made. If you find any error I suggest you take it up with Mr. Fraser. It is only for the convenience of the committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: With regard to its conclusion, I do not know how that works out.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we asked that Mr. Carbonneau be here to-day. Would it meet with the convenience of the committee if we called Mr. Carbonneau at this time?

HECTOR CARBONNEAU, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Carbonneau, I understand that you are the chief of the translators branch?—A. I am, sir.

Q. The Translators branch of the House of Commons, I presume?—A. That is, the chief of the General Translation Branch of the House of Commons.

Q. The general blue books branch?—A. Yes.

Q. How long have you occupied that position, Mr. Carbonneau?—A. I have been chief of the branch since the 1st of November, 1930.

Q. And how many years have you been a translator in the government service?—A. I have been a translator since the year 1923. Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I should like to make a statement before the Committee regarding the activities of the General Translation Branch.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that is always subject to the understanding already arrived at that as Mr. Carbonneau is about to read his statement we reserve our right to read his evidence and then he will be available for questioning. Is that the understanding?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. One question. When did you start to work first as a translator?—A. As a translator?

Q. Yes?—A. Did you say where or when?

Q. In what year?—A. In 1923, in the Customs department.

Q. That was the first time you worked for the government as a translator?—A. Well, officially, yes. I had been making some translation in the year 1912 for the Post Office department for a few months, but I was not then an official translator.

Q. You were not permanent?—A. I was permanent, but as a clerk—not as a translator.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Before 1923 were you an employee of a department, or did you begin to work for the government since 1923?—A. I was an employee of the Federal government since 1911.

Mr. POULIOT: But in a different capacity?

The WITNESS: Oh, yes.

The General Translation Branch of the House of Commons is composed of ten parliamentary translators and one chief translator. It is the largest technical translation service in the federal administration. To this branch is assigned primarily the task of translating from English into French:

SCOPE OF WORK

1. Records of the House of Commons, such as Proceedings, Evidence and Reports of Standing and Special committees, Estimates, Budget Resolutions and other papers which may from time to time be required by His Honour the Speaker or the Clerk of the House.

2. Findings of advisory Boards and Councils, Royal Commissions and permanent Boards.

3. Reports of Imperial Conferences and other international documents such as commercial agreements, diplomatic notes and correspondence, etc.

4. Annual reports and other publications issued by various departments where no translators are available or existing translation services are inadequate.

A list of the various documents translated by this branch during the calendar year 1933 is appended hereto.

Mr. POULIOT: Will you read that list afterwards?

The WITNESS: If you wish I will.

The CHAIRMAN: Does he need to read it, or can we take it as filed.

Mr. POULIOT: Just to be familiar with the whole thing.

The WITNESS: I am ready to read it if you like.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not wish to interrupt you. You might read it afterwards.

The WITNESS: As may be noted from the attached list, the work performed by the branch although mainly parliamentary is also departmental.

A survey of our records for the year 1933 shows that the proportion of parliamentary translation performed by the branch as compared with departmental documents is over 70 per cent. Within the House of Commons the branch has collaborated with the Speaker's office, clerk's office, Sergeant-at-Arms Branch, Committee and Private Legislation Branch, Accountant's Branch, Journals Branch, Law Translation Branch, Debates Translation Branch.

The branch has also supplied assistance to the following departments, boards, commissions, etc.:—Department of Finance, Department of the Interior, Department of Insurance, Department of Railways and Canals, Department of Justice, Department of Immigration and Colonization, Department of the Secretary of State, Department of External Affairs, Department of Labour, Board of Railway Commissioners, Board of Pension Commissioners, Prime Minister's office, Civil Service Commission, Committee appointed to investigate into the administration of the Pension Act, Royal Commission on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Did I understand you to say that the parliamentary work in 1934 of your branch represented 70 per cent of the whole?

The WITNESS: In 1933 it was 70 per cent. In fact, I think it is over 70 per cent.

Mr. CHEVRIER: 70 per cent parliamentary duties.

The WITNESS:

PARLIAMENTARY STATUS OF THE GENERAL TRANSLATION BRANCH

The Branch owes its parliamentary status to the fact that it was created for the purpose of translating parliamentary papers. Departmental reports fell in that category inasmuch as they became records of Parliament after being tabled. It was on this account that our translators were classified as Parliamentary translators by the Civil Service Commission some eight years ago.

DISTRIBUTION OF WORK

By reason of its diversity, the work is distributed amongst the men best versed in the particular subject under translation. Most translators have specialized in certain fields and they are entrusted, in so far as possible, with the care of translating, checking or revising all texts falling within their particular scope of knowledge.

Every translator, although specialized on one or more subjects, is more or less a generalist who can assist in other spheres when required. While short documents are usually translated by one man only in order to ensure perfect uniformity, both in terms and phraseology, long reports are, however, distributed amongst several members of the staff. It may so happen that a translator may not be intimately acquainted with the subject to be dealt with, but he can at least prepare a first draft of the text and the technical part of it can easily be handled later by a colleague who is more familiar with the subject. Our work calls for close co-operation. What may be found difficult to one translator may readily be understood by another. Should a particular subject be entirely new to all translators, although this seldom happens, they can get in touch with the officer or department who prepared the document, or they may obtain the information necessary from our library or the Library of Parliament which is close at hand.

Thus, with co-ordination of efforts, none are left idle, all translators being fully occupied either in technical or in other duties.

INTRICACY OF WORK

Every branch of knowledge involves a special terminology. Law has a language all its own, so has medicine and natural science. There are accepted forms which must be observed in drafting Orders in Council, in drawing up Rules and Regulations, Deeds and Contracts, in writing official or polite letters. Commerce itself carries a tremendous vocabulary and also special expressions that one must forget in writing a speech or a pamphlet of a literary character.

The many subjects embraced by government publications cover a large vocabulary which at times demand from the translators extensive research. Familiarity with the subject under translation is, therefore, indispensable. Many years of experience and study are necessary before a man even with a good bilingual education can become an accurate translator. Translation is not in any way mechanical. It is only when a man has thoroughly specialized in a subject that he can attempt to translate at sight. Even then, a specialist could not render into another language in a few days, technical or scientific works which, oftentimes, have taken experts weeks or even months to prepare. Translation of this kind has to be done slowly and with great care. It cannot be dictated to a stenographer in the same manner as, for instance, a letter or a memorandum.

PROFICIENCY OF THE STAFF

With a view to improving their knowledge, and in order to become acquainted with the terms which apply to new inventions, our translators must keep continually studying technology by reading scientific magazines and books

of like character at home, so as to gather technical notes which are then carefully classified under a card index system and made available at a moment's notice.

Two years ago one of our translators was assigned the task of making a survey of the vocabulary used in the Civil Service in France and the knowledge thus acquired was put into good use in revising the translation of the report of the Civil Service Committee. It was also found of material benefit in translating the report of the Civil Service Commission last year. The old French electoral terminology was also modernized when translating the proceedings and evidence of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. This year the financial terms used in public accounts were brought up to date, after extensive research made from the public accounts of the French government.

I may say in all fairness to our translators that they have all generously responded when their services were urgently required, even though it meant having to work after office hours and on holidays.

LACK OF UNIFORMITY IN THE COPY

The greatest difficulty which confronted me when I took charge of this Branch in November, 1930, was the lack of uniformity in vocabulary and language, as a result of translations being made in parts, that is, distributed among several translators. It has been customary for years in the Branch to divide the work in signatures or 16-page portions among the staff. While such translated portions might have been acceptable as separate units, when linked together there was a visible lack of homogeneity in the whole. This was still more striking in the case of short reports. The inevitable consequence was the necessity for corrections. However, after a study of this problem, I found out that it could be remedied to some appreciable extent. The following measures were therefore taken:—

1. In special cases when strict uniformity had to be observed, a system of notes was introduced whereby the most common forms and expressions occurring in the texts were distributed among the translators. This system was followed in translating the last two or three McDougall reports on Reparations.

2. Short reports were given, whenever possible, to one man only. The McDougall Supplementary Report, 1930-31, the Civil Service Commission Report, 1932, and a half dozen other reports were later translated in that way. It is impossible, however, to rigidly apply this principle when the translation is required immediately.

3. Instructions as to conciseness in the texts were given to all and soon became a general practice in the branch. This seems to have been the key to a greater part of the trouble because after translators had striven to find the proper terms and the shortest forms of expression, a great improvement soon became evident in the copy. It has been possible to save in this way considerable space in printing. It is worthy of note that while in the past some of our French texts were from 10 to 15 per cent longer than the English, now many of our translations are about the same length and sometimes even shorter. The French version of the Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for 1931 is about 10 per cent shorter than the original, while the 929 pages of the Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Committee on the Civil Service have been rendered in 923 pages. But taking into account the blank spaces and pages left in the French volume, the text should have covered only about 905 pages, thus representing a saving of about 75 pages over the old system. This we consider to be a notable attainment when we take into consideration the fact that it is generally admitted that French is longer than

English, and this alone will show that an earnest effort has been made to improve the quality of translation as well as to reduce the cost of printing by the use of proper terms instead of paraphrases and roundabout expressions.

4. The final revision of certain annual reports of a very technical nature has been given year after year to the same men. In this class may be mentioned the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals and that of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

5. Translations of a general character are revised by regular revisers whose duty it is to check or correct them, if necessary, as to,

- (a) accuracy and uniformity of technical terms, conciseness and correctness in phraseology;
- (b) uniformity of translation in headings, tables, statements, references or other features occurring many times throughout the text;
- (c) accuracy of figures or other data;
- (d) preparation of indexes, etc.

Further improvement in uniformity could be made in the translation of certain periodical reports by giving to one translator a full chapter of such reports instead of one signature. To illustrate this, I shall take the annual report of the Interior Department which is divided into six chapters, viz:—

- I—Dominion Lands Administration.
- II—Forestry.
- III—National Parks of Canada.
- IV—Water Power and Hydrometric Bureau.
- V—Topographical Survey.
- VI—Geodetic Survey and International Boundary Commission.

These various chapters are prepared every year by different officials and constitute in themselves separate units. It is most desirable that they should be translated every year by the same persons.

6. A list should also be prepared in French with a view to securing uniformity in forms and terms most commonly used throughout the public service, as well as in the use of capital letters and it should be adhered to by all translators and printers. Proposed additions and changes should be noted on blank pages left for that purpose at the end of such list which should be revised every year and approved by a committee of translators in order to make it more authoritative.

DICTATION OF NON-TECHNICAL TRANSLATIONS

Time-saving is an important factor in translation work. Some years ago, as a translator in the Department of Customs and Excise, I began by writing out my translations in long hand. But correspondence, memoranda and reports piled up before me to such an alarming extent that, although I laboured for long hours I soon realized that despite all my diligence and efforts I could not cope with the situation. I then changed my system entirely and after a careful examination of the difficulties, I commenced to dictate my translations to a stenographer. In a month or two I was amazed at the results. Not only could I dictate as rapidly as the stenographer could take it down but I was able to complete my work from day to day. The minister then suggested, in order that I might be kept fully occupied, that I should take over his French incoming and outgoing technical correspondence. I carried on this work for two years with less effort than I had expended in the first place.

This experience served me to good advantage three years ago when we took over the correspondence of the Department of Finance. I then suggested to the

staff that all letters, memoranda and other documents of a non-technical character should be dictated. During the session we obtained the services of two bilingual stenographers and, by dictating, the work was rapidly done, much to the satisfaction of that department. Unfortunately, we were obliged to discontinue the work of the Department of Finance last year owing to the fact that we were short of help and that our parliamentary work had gone behind.

The dictation of correspondence to a stenographer was followed later by the translation of other documents in the same manner, thus saving considerable time. We have on record the case of a translator who dictated to a typist eighteen pages of printed matter in less than a day and also that of another member of the staff who dictated twenty-five pages in one day. But this should not be taken as a standard. No translator, however healthy he may be, could stand such a strain indefinitely as translation is a most exacting task. Three pages of ordinary matter a day is considered a good average for a translator who types his own work. Even at this rate, if carried on during the recess, and the session comes along with its added strain, the staff is exhausted when parliament closes.

DUAL PARLIAMENTARY AND DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

Speaking from experience acquired especially in the last two years, which were particularly onerous to the staff, it is my opinion that dual service of this kind is detrimental to the simultaneous publication of both parliamentary and departmental reports. Both régimes are on an entirely different basis, as regards working hours, privileges, etc. During sessions precedence is necessarily given to parliamentary work and departmental reports sent in for translation must necessarily wait sometimes until many months after prorogation. On the other hand, if a special call is made for the translation of some urgent departmental report, parliamentary work is delayed. This dual régime is detrimental also to the translators who, after strenuous sessions, have to keep on duty to answer the many calls of departments and work after office hours and on holidays in order to meet emergency cases. Our translators, although classified as Parliamentary Translators, do not enjoy the privileges granted in other branches and, therefore, are labouring under a discrimination. Such conditions should not prevail. Similar treatment should be accorded to all parliamentary translators and steps should be taken to remove from the Branch duties which do not come under the immediate supervision or control of Parliament.

I may also add that this year, with the demand for simultaneous publication of parliamentary committee proceedings and evidence, both in English and in French our Branch not only finds itself unable to assist the departments but with the existing staff and the further assistance of three temporary translators it cannot even cope with the work on hand.

SIMULTANEOUS PUBLICATION

I believe that better results could be obtained in having both versions published simultaneously if there were closer co-operation between departments concerned and the translation services with regard to reports to be tabled in the House. Departments and various officers are bound by different statutes to submit reports or other periodical statements to the House of Commons within the time stated in the *List of Reports and Returns* prepared by the Clerk of the House and printed before every session of Parliament, in compliance with Standing Order 84 of the House, copy of which is hereto attached. For example, the Board of Railway Commissioners' report, which has been for some years translated by our Branch, should be made forthwith or within the first 15 days of the session, in accordance with the Revised Statutes, chap. 170, Sec. 31. Such reports should be forwarded soon enough to allow of their translation being

efficiently made before they are tabled, for the House is in the same position as a court of law which is not expected to copy, translate or complete in any way the exhibits produced for its consideration.

It is also necessary that all English texts for publication in French should be received in typewritten form, *but only after alterations have been fully made*. This condition is worthy of particular mention because lately some original documents were altered without our being advised and considerable time was lost in obtaining galley-proofs from the Department and vouchers from the Printing Bureau in order to trace corrections. It also became necessary to compare both versions before sending ours to the printers, which resulted in an additional loss of time.

It is further submitted that in view of ensuring a simultaneous issuance of both versions, the following measures should be taken:—

1. Annual reports or other periodical publications should be prepared a little ahead of the ordinary time and the compilation of data and drafting of such reports should be accelerated in some cases.

2. These reports should be sent for translation in typewritten form *when all corrections have been made*.

3. A list of reports and returns to be tabled each session should be prepared, fixing certain dates for the guidance of all departments in sending their annual reports for translation.

MAINTENANCE OF THE BRANCH UNDER PARLIAMENT

In the discharge of their parliamentary duties, especially during sessions, when they are so often working under high pressure, our translators have to keep in close contact with the Clerk of the House and Committee Clerks with whom they have to consult almost daily. When committees are sitting, they are often asked to translate into English evidence given in French, which is to be printed simultaneously with the English text. They have also to consult witnesses and counsel. Committee reports are generally tabled at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and are generally handed in for translation about one hour before this. Quite often these reports must be translated and then typewritten with several carbon copies. They cannot be delayed and, therefore, the translators must be immediately available. They must also be close to their source of information and have free access to all parliamentary papers, both recent and old, and to the Library of Parliament. As officials of the House they are part of the machinery of Parliament and should be able to avail themselves of these privileges. Almost daily they need information of some kind or another and it must be obtained at once. On account of the very special and urgent character of their duties, they could not be centralized outside of Parliament without their work being seriously hampered. I would therefore respectfully suggest that the Branch be maintained as a parliamentary technical service for the translation of Committee proceedings and evidence, estimates and budget resolutions and other related documents, in a measure commensurate with the requirements of Parliament.

Mr. POULIOT: Will you please read the other thing that you have laid aside.

The WITNESS: This is a memorandum covering the work performed by the General Translation Branch of the House of Commons during the calendar year 1933.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pouliot, could we not accomplish the same purpose and save a good deal of time if Mr. Carbonneau handed the memorandum to the reporter.

Mr. POULIOT: I am quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: It will be incorporated in the record just the same.

MEMORANDUM COVERING THE WORK PERFORMED BY THE GENERAL TRANSLATION
BRANCH OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1933

During the calendar year 1933, the following reports, papers, etc., were translated from English into French or vice versa:—

Reparations 1930-31—Maltreatment of Prisoners of War (partly translated).

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1932 (partly translated).

Dominion of Canada 4 per cent Loan, 1932—various forms translated at the request of the Department of Finance.

Forms A, B, C, *re* registered Insurance;

Circular letter *re* registered Insurance;

and list of Companies; translated or checked at the request of the Department of Insurance.

Echange de notes relativement à l'effet que comportent les termes du traité relatif à la Canalisation du Saint-Laurent (Expertise pour le Département des Affaires extérieures).

Proceedings and Evidence of the Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting, 1932.

Yamaska Controverted Election in the Supreme Court of Canada.

Translation into French of the memorial of the Registrar of the Supreme Court, and of Exhibits B, C, and D. Translation into English of: jugement des honorables Coderre et Denis—Exhibit A.

Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1934.

Extracts of a book on International Law, translated into English at the request of the Right Honourable Mr. Bennett.

Questions and Notices of motion translated from French into English, between the 30th of January and the 8th of June, for the Votes and Proceedings.

Questions: 128.

Notices of motion: 78.

Debates of the House translated from French into English, for the Hansard Branch: 48 pages.

La Propagande Anti-religieuse des Soviets au Canada, translated into English.

Report of the Superintendent of Penitentiaries *re* Kingston Penitentiary disturbances, 1932.

Report of the Committee appointed to investigate into the Administration of the Pension Act, 1932.

Report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the year ended September 30, 1932.

Supplementary Estimates for the year 1933-34.

Guide to the National Museum, partly translated.

Further Supplementary Estimates for the year 1933-34.

Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, 1933.

The Relief Act, 1932—Report of the Dominion Commissioner of Unemployment Relief—March 31, 1933.

Bill No. 2—An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

Le Régime des Affaires étrangères, newspapers' articles translated for the Department of Finance.

Resolutions to amend the Customs Tariff.

Projet de règlement d'une caisse-bétail (memorandum to Mr. Onésime Gagnon, M.P.) translated from French into English.

Budget Speech delivered by the Hon. Edgar Rhodes, March 21, 1933.
Reprint, proof-reading made at the request of the Department of Finance.

Proceedings and Evidence of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission of Canada.
Positions exempted from the Civil Service Act.

Evidence of Messrs. Chartrand and Desjardins before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, translated from French into English.

Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders—Second Report.

Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders—Third Report.

Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders—Eighth Report.

Memorandum on Industrial Act of the Province of Quebec, April 11, 1933, translated from French into English at the request of the Department of Insurance.

Conversion Loan, 1933—Forms, circulars, letters of instructions, prospectus, advertisements, etc., translated at the request of the Department of Finance.

Report of the Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills.

Memorandum on the Water power problem translated for the House of Commons.

Special Committee appointed to consider Bill No. 2, an Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons—Fifth Report.

Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Report of the Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills, 18th May, 1933.

Special Committee on Pension Bill No. 78—Second and Final Report.

Miscellaneous Private Bills—Fifth Report.

Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills—Sixth Report.

Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization—Fifth Report.

Various Headings and Notes translated into English for the Department of Insurance.

Supplementary Estimates for the Fiscal year ending March 31, 1934.

Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce—Sixth Report.

Speech from the Throne closing the 4th Session of the 11th Parliament.

Canada Week by Week—Numbers of July 15th, 22nd, 29th, August 5th and 12th, translated at the request of the Department of Immigration.

Reparations, 1932—Further Report.

Twenty-eighth Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Reparations, 1932-33—Final Report.

Board of Pension Commissioners—Evidence before the Board and before the Supreme Court, translated from French into English, 190 typewritten pages.

Le Commerce International, newspapers articles translated into English at the request of the Right Honourable Mr. Bennett.

Two Balance Sheets translated from the French into English for the Department of Insurance.

Notes for the Department of Insurance.

Report of the Royal Commission on Banking and Currency in Canada, 1933.

Banking, Currency and Coinage, address translated at the request of the Hon. Mr. Cahan.

Annual Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1933.

Ordinance regarding the protection of the Reindeer.

Regulations regarding the protection of the Reindeer, translated at the request of the Department of the Interior.

Summary of the Report of the Royal Commission on Banking and Currency, translated into French for the Press at the request of the Department of Finance.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1933.

Circular letters and Forms regarding the Conversion Loan, translated for the Department of Finance.

Requête des "Jeunes Canada" au Très Hon. Premier Ministre—"Mémoire accompagnant la requête," translated into English for the Right Honourable Mr. Bennett.

The development of Transportation in Canada—Reprint from the Report of the Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation.

Forest Products Laboratories of Canada (Heating Value of Wood Fuels), translated at the request of the Department of the Interior.

In Memoriam—The Memorial Chamber, Canadian Houses of Parliament—Introduction and 16 Historical Panels.

Wheat production and the London agreement, translated at the request of the Right Honourable Mr. Bennett.

This branch has also translated 694 letters, documents, petitions, memoranda, etc., on behalf of the Department of Finance, the House of Commons, the Prime Minister's office and the Department of Insurance. It has also answered hundreds of calls from various departments for technical terms and phrases."

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen are there any questions you wish to ask of Mr. Carbonneau?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not at the moment, sir. I may have when the report is published.

The CHAIRMAN: I think he will be available to the committee at any time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: On that understanding I have no questions to ask this morning.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Carbonneau, I have one or two things that I made a note of in connection with your statement. You said that translators on your staff do not receive the same privileges as other translators. I presume you refer to those who translate Hansard?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you be good enough to tell me what privileges you do not get which those other translators do?—A. Well, I do not like to make any comparison between my staff and Hansard, but our translators do not enjoy any holidays during the recess. That is the point I was alluding to.

Q. I was going to ask you about that.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. You work continuously?—A. Yes, we work continuously.

Q. During the recess too?—A. During the recess.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is that all you had in mind when you said they did not enjoy the same privileges and treatment?—A. That was practically all, yes.

Q. Just following that up, your staff with the exception of the statutory holidays provided under the Civil Service Act are on the job all the year round?—A. All the year round.

Q. And the statutory holidays which you receive under the Act, I presume, are the three weeks plus certain other things provided for in the Act?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And how many hours a day is your staff required to work ordinarily?—A. Do you mean during the session or outside of the session?

Q. Both as a matter of fact?—A. Well, during the session our hours I should say are more or less regular.

Q. Did you say regular?—A. Yes. Of course, our situation is now changed since we are now trying to publish the French version of the committee reports simultaneously with the English. We have not yet been able to do it simultaneously but we are trying to do it, and our translators are translating about six pages a day. During the recess they translate about two or three pages.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. An hour?—A. In a day. Some of our translators come to work in the morning as early as eight o'clock, but most of them come about nine and they leave about six o'clock in the afternoon.

By the Chairman:

Q. Does that mean now both during the session and during recess?—A. No, that is during the session.

Q. So that during the session your staff are really working longer hours than the ordinary civil servants?—A. Oh, yes. And moreover, it very frequently happens that we are called on to work at night especially when translating the estimates, budget resolutions, and other related documents; we are very frequently called upon to work at night and sometimes on holidays.

Q. So I can take it, Mr. Carbonneau, that during the session the translators on your staff frequently have to put in, say, four or five additional hours a week on the average over and above the regular civil service hours of 9 A.M. to 12.30 and 2 to 5?—A. Yes, sir at least.

Q. Between sessions when the House is not in session then, do your translators have to work from 9 in the morning till 12.30 and from 2 to 5, or do you give them some time off then to balance up for the extra time during the session?—A. Yes, more or less we try to give them a little compensation, but it so happens that we cannot follow that procedure all the time because we are very frequently asked by departments to do other urgent translations and are, therefore, sometimes handicapped.

Q. Well now, Mr. Carbonneau, you as chief translator of this branch try as far as possible to give your translators shorter hours between sessions to compensate them for the longer hours during the session?—A. We have been trying to do that in the past more or less.

Q. I appreciate it cannot be perfect?—A. No.

Q. One other thing. I am informed that in the matter of holidays you and your staff do not come under the civil service regulations, is that correct?—A. Well, I should think we do come under the civil service regulations.

Q. For example, each summer does every translator on your staff get three weeks holidays?—A. We get a little more; we have been getting about a month.

Q. And for the purpose of getting that month, do you as chief of that branch have to write to the Civil Service Commission and get their approval of that additional holiday?—A. No sir. It has been a long established rule in the branch.

Q. And in order to lay out and arrange which of your translators shall go on holidays do you have to get the approval of the Civil Service Commission?—A. No, sir.

Q. So you really are exempted from the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Act by the House of Commons Act, are you not?—A. I could not answer you offhand on that.

Q. Well, can I put it this way: In any event, you are not limited or prescribed in the matter of holidays by the provisions of and the regulations under the Civil Service Act?—A. I do not think so.

Q. And the translators in your branch get, you have told us, a months holidays?—A. Yes.

Q. Whereas the ordinary civil servants get three weeks?—A. Three weeks.

Q. By "ordinary" I mean the civil servants coming under the Civil Service Act?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, I have one or two other things here I wanted to clear up in my own mind. You point out in your memorandum that you feel the work of your branch would be handicapped if you were removed—I think you said—outside of parliament. Do you mean by that if the place in which your work is done was moved from this building over to the Hunter Building, for example, is that what you have in mind?—A. Exactly.

Q. You feel that in order to attain the greatest efficiency your staff should be housed and continue to be housed in this building in which we are now sitting?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In order that you might readily have access to parliamentary papers and parliamentary offices?—A. Yes.

Q. If a Central Bureau were formed, so long as your branch were still housed in this building that would not interfere with your efficiency then, would it?—A. Well, it would interfere less; I do not believe it would interfere.

Q. I see what you mean, it would interfere less?—A. Yes.

Q. It would interfere less with your efficiency if your branch continued to be housed in this building. Another thing, you pointed out in your memorandum that for the purpose of translating technical papers and documents and scientific documents it was very advantageous to have the cooperation of all your translators?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, if I understood it, what you had in mind was this: That one man on your staff of ten, we will take for example, Mr. Beauchamp might have some documents to translate containing technical terms which might be more familiar to Mr. Chartrand, and hence he would have the advantage of obtaining Mr. Chartrand's advice and co-operation in order to obtain the best results?

Q. Well now, if you had a Central Bureau of Translation, and instead of having the co-operation of nine other men in addition to yourself you had the co-operation of 90, it would still be beneficial for the purposes of co-operation would it not?—A. Well, it might, but that has always been the trouble to divide up the work in a single bureau; it has always been a great trouble to obtain perfect uniformity especially when the work is being distributed in parts, in fact, I think it is the greatest trouble with which we are confronted in our branch.

Q. But, Mr. Carboneau, are you not presuming that if a Central Bureau is established then your translators are going to be all broken up and a man who was previously translating blue books is going to be sent down to, we will say, translate statistics, and a man who has been doing statistics is going to be sent over the Public Works Department to carry on correspondence; just leave that presumption out of your mind, and assume that you have a Central Bureau organized and that Mr. Carboneau is still chief of a division of that bureau and his job is to translate blue books and matters for the House of Commons, and he still has his staff of translators, surely he is bound to have an advantage if he can go to the chief or a translator in other branches for co-operation any time he wants it?—A. Well, I should think so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Arising out of that, Mr. Carboneau, let me put it this way: Supposing that all of these translators over which you preside remained where they are, you would then have the benefit of nine experts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In that particular branch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But if you had to refer to ninety translators would you get the same standard of efficiency as if you referred to nine experts in that particular branch of work?—A. Well, I do not think I would get the same efficiency in the beginning. I might get it later on but in the beginning it is doubtful.

Q. Now then, if all of these people are to be left where they are, if your translators are to be left where they are now then you would only have the benefit of your nine translators, because if all of the other translators are left where they are to-day and you want the benefit of somebody else you would have to chase away from the House of Commons and go elsewhere around the various departments?

The CHAIRMAN: He has to do that now, has he not?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, he said that he had the benefit of nine expert translators in parliamentary work.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, he would still have.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are no other parliamentary translators outside of the House of Commons.

The WITNESS: There are not.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. So that the only experts that you need in parliamentary translation are the parliamentary translators?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that it would be of no benefit to you if the others are left where they are because you would not have the benefit of experts due to the fact that they are not parliamentary translators?—A. I am opposed to that dual régime.

Q. So am I.—A. In a parliamentary and departmental translation service, one is an obstacle to the other. They do not work out well together.

Q. Now, you are the chief over this parliamentary translating branch. How would you like to work under a superintendent, whose functions the Bill does not indicate—I do not know he would do—but if there was a superintendent and you were left where you are, what do you think, would that improve the efficiency?—A. Well, it is pretty hard to say. It might be advantageous in so far as control of expenditure is concerned.

Q. But would it improve your particular work if you had somebody as a superintendent over this bureau of translation, would your work be done better than it is now?—A. Well, I think we are doing fairly good work.

Q. That is all subject to my needing any information after I read through the evidence?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I have just a couple of questions to ask you. You have tabled these books on Capitalization for Hansard and Standard Forms and Practices. Are they for uniformity of translations?—A. No. I think they are more for the Hansard branch. What I really meant was that we should have in the service—either the parliamentary service or the general service—something along these lines. Lately there were complaints that there was no uniformity in the different translations. In 1920 the translators founded an association called L'Association Technologique de Langue Française d'Ottawa. And they discussed that matter. I was then the chairman of that association, and someone suggested then that we should have in the service a list of that kind for the uniformity of terms in the Federal service.

Q. My idea when listening to you was that you were trying to establish a certain kind of uniformity in the same kind of publications issued from

your branch. I will explain what I have in mind. It is this: you want as much as possible to have certain documents translated by one man, and, if it is not possible, to have it translated by two men in a uniform way?—A. Yes.

Q. You realized just how difficult it was to establish uniformity amongst the translators in your own branch?—A. It is difficult.

Q. It is very difficult?—A. It is.

Q. And you have nine men under you?—A. Yes.

Q. And you realize the difficulty of establishing uniformity amongst nine men?—A. Ten men.

Q. Yes, ten men—a small number. Well, do you believe that it will be much harder to have uniformity amongst eighty-four?—A. Well, it is a very complicated question. Of course, it all depends upon how the work would be co-ordinated. If there were a lack of organization in that line, the work might be divided into sections, and then if divided into sections there might be a great improvement in uniformity. But I have not given the matter any thought.

Q. I will take it from another point of view. Now, you have ten men under you, and you told us they were consulting each other?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The proportion was ten to one; but if you have eighty-four translators together you realize that the proportion of disturbance to each translator will be eighty-four to one?—A. Well, I do not know if I should say that. I do not know if there would be that disturbance. This is a very complicated matter. Of course, if the Bureau is created, it is only when it has been organized that we will know exactly how it will work, and the value of it. There might be ways of dividing up the work into sections.

Q. Yes, within the Bureau. Did you receive any unsatisfactory complaints since you have occupied that position, about the work?—A. I never have.

Q. You never received any complaints of that kind?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. You said that some duties which you now perform do not properly come under parliament and should be removed from your particular jurisdiction. Could you specify what you mean?—A. I mean departmental translation work, for we have likely been translating annual reports and some correspondence and other documents for various departments outside of the House of Commons.

Q. You mentioned the report of the Railway Commission?—A. Yes, we have, perhaps, half a dozen or more annual reports, besides correspondence and memoranda, and other documents of that kind for certain departments.

Q. Do you think that your duties should be confined to parliamentary reports?—A. Certainly. I am quite convinced of that.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do you do actual translation work?—A. Very seldom.

Q. Your duties are mostly supervisory?—A. Yes. I revise the work as much as I can.

Q. Since you took your present position you have made many improvements in co-ordinating the services in your branch?—A. I think I have, for I have spent a great part of my time studying the question, trying to improve methods.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You did that outside of office hours?—A. I have spent two or three evenings a week sometimes studying the situation, revising translations, even gathering from books and magazines technological information that we needed for some special work.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Have you any knowledge of the translation work outside of your own department—that is, the organization?—A. Well, I may have, but I would not like to make any definite statement on outside work.

Q. You do not need to answer this question unless you like. Do you think there is room for improvement, taking translators as a whole?—A. There is always room for improvement in everything. Of course, I have no authority to speak for other services. I am speaking about my own. That is beyond my competence.

Q. The whole thing could possibly be co-ordinated more than it is at the present time?—A. I should not like to make any different statement about that, for I think there are other heads of branches who can speak for themselves.

Q. You were in the Civil Service in some other capacity before being employed as a translator?—A. I was, sir.

Q. Did you pass a competitive examination for your appointment as translator?—A. I did, sir.

By the Chairman:

Q. Who at the present time has any power or any authority to call on you or your branch to do any work other than the translation of parliamentary documents?—A. In fact, I do not believe that anybody has the power.

Q. No. That is what I had in mind. At the moment you are a servant under the authority of parliament?—A. Exactly.

Q. And no Minister or anybody else has authority or power to say to you, "Mr. Carbonneau, your branch shall or shall not do thus and so"?—A. There is no order in council to that effect.

Q. Then, just one other thing. You translate French into English as well as English into French—when I say you, I mean your branch?—A. In certain cases we do, but we only began that work, I think, a couple of years ago. For years we had not done very much of that.

Q. Now, you told Mr. MacInnis that you yourself did little, if any, original translation. You are the revising officer?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Of your branch?—A. Yes.

Q. And, I presume if some translator has some difficulty as to how he should translate a word or phrase and consults some other translator, and they should not agree, the matter is referred to you?—A. Yes. They come to me, and we look up the dictionaries and discuss the matter together.

Q. I might take a concrete case. I think that the English word, "through" is usually interpreted in French by the word "par"; is that correct?—A. Yes, "through" and "par"—in certain instances.

Q. And, also, the word "for" is frequently translated as "par" is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. POULIOT: And "pour" also.

The WITNESS: Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. What I have in mind, Mr. Carbonneau, frankly is this: occasionally in my practice as a lawyer I have to try to interpret the statutes of the province of Quebec, written in French, into English and sometimes we have great difficulty in determining whether the word "par" means "through" or, "for" in that particular statute?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Assuming that a situation of that kind arose, I assume that part of your duties as revising officer is to try so to phrase the context that the French person reading that text will know whether the English person who has spoken the English phrase used the word "through" or the word "for"?—A. Yes.

Q. Because, they may have a very different meaning in the English language?—A. Absolutely.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Do you translate some statutes?—A. We do not; although we have translated part of a Bill. We helped in translating a Bill a couple of years ago. It was the Redistribution Bill, if I well remember.

By the Chairman:

Q. Now, one other thing, Mr. Carbonneau. So far as I am concerned, I imagine this also applies to the members of the committee. I approach this matter, you see, with an absolutely open mind. I knew nothing about it until I read this Bill brought down in parliament. What we are anxious to find out, if we can, is, will the translation services, in as far as your particular branch is concerned—that is what I am interested in while you are here—be injuriously affected in any way by the consolidation of all translation services in the government, so long as there is no interference with work being done by your staff?—A. I do not think so. I do not think so, if there were interference.

Q. In other words, if you continue to be chief of the blue book branch—the general blue book branch—you will continue to carry on from time to time and try to improve the efficiency of your branch just as you have done in the past?—A. Absolutely.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not get what that means—"consolidation without interference." If there is a consolidation of all the services without interference, then it means that you stay just as you are to-day.

The WITNESS: I don't know if I were right—

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What is consolidation? The Chairman put the question to you, and he asked you if there was a consolidation of all the services, and, provided that you remained exactly where you are, would that interfere with your work. Now, if you remained exactly where you are to-day, would that interfere with your work?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Of course, it would not. If you remain as you are, it would not interfere?—A. No.

Q. Now, if there is a consolidation, and all of the departments remain where they are to-day—if all other translators remain where they are to-day—then that is what I have said all along; I do not see the utility of this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not what I am dealing with. It is quite possible that it may be very advantageous to have a central bureau of translation, and, yet, at the same time, it may make for the greatest efficiency to leave this particular gentleman and his particular translators undisturbed either as to location or salary, or volume of work or plans of work.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is all right, Mr. Chairman; that is a question of opinion; but I have seen no evidence of that yet.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in the Bill to intimate otherwise.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not see how that works. I have been losing sleep trying to find out how this Bill is going to work by leaving everybody as they are.

Mr. ERNST: I think we can conceive it is not going to leave everybody where they are.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I do not know what this Bill is here for then. Now, you do parliamentary translations, general translations and departmental translations?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, in answer to a question from the chairman, you said there was nobody who could order you to do departmental translations? A. No, sir.

Q. But, as a matter of fact, you do departmental translation?—A. Yes. We were asked if we would be kind enough to do such and such.

Q. And any time that a Minister or Deputy Minister asks you to do some departmental translation you have always done it?—A. We do it when we can.

Q. You never refused?—A. In fact, we have refused very frequently.

Q. What?—A. In fact, we have refused work very frequently because we had too much to do.

Q. It was not because you do not recognize the authority of somebody to give it to you?—A. No.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Referring to what you have just said. You are the head of the blue book branch, and you do not give us an opinion about the translations which are done outside of your branch, because you prefer to mind your own business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You wish to put it plainly?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: A lot of time and effort and labour would be saved if everybody did that.

The WITNESS: I think that there are other gentlemen who can speak for themselves. They might tell me to mind my own business.

Mr. POULIOT: You have no authority to speak for the others?

The WITNESS: I have no competence to speak for them.

Mr. POULIOT: Now, sir, who presents the estimates of your salaries to the House?

Mr. LAURIN: It is very important.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I mean the estimates of the blue book branch?—A. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What minister presents them?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Do they come from the Speaker?—A. I have never seen them. I do not know. I think they come from the Speaker.

Q. And your deputy is the clerk of the House?—A. Yes.

Q. You are under his jurisdiction?—A. Yes.

Q. And many other departments come to you for translations?—A. Well, they come to me either directly, or through the clerk of the House, or through the Speaker.

Q. Or directly?—A. Yes, mostly directly, to save time.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. One other question in view of the questions I have been asked in regard to the same thing. I was trying to get from the witness the impression as to whether or not the improvement of the translation services as a whole could be effected by better organization. Because of his modesty he did not like to answer the question direct; but I will put it in another way. Suppose, for instance, you were made superintendent over this bureau, do you think you could organize the service as a whole as it is now, without making reference to any particular branch of it?—A. Well, if I were superintendent of that bureau, in the first place I would be very surprised.

Q. Do you think you would be too surprised to act?—A. Well, I do not know.

Mr. POULIOT: This is a very definite question.

The CHAIRMAN: You are not bound to answer that, Mr. Carboneau.

The WITNESS: Yes. I think there is always room for improvement.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You spoke about the treatment of the translators—your translators were supposed to have the same treatment as others. Do you mean to say you compare their work with the work of the translators of the House of Commons?—A. The Hansard. Yes, I do not like to make any comparison with other branches, but I do think that they do not receive the same privileges in as far as holidays are concerned—like, say, for instance, the Easter recess. The translators—of course, I do not speak for myself—the translators are not receiving the same—getting the same holidays.

Q. But if you compare the privileges of your translators with those of the translators of other departments, do they have the same privileges, the same treatment as these others?—A. I suppose they have the same treatment.

Q. The translators of the other department—do they work the whole year?—A. They do, sir.

Q. And are they supposed to have only three weeks of holidays?—A. So far as I know, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Aren't you getting things confused? Are you referring to those who translate Hansard?

Mr. LAURIN: No, departments.

The CHAIRMAN: No. They come under the Civil Service Act; but, you see, they do not have to put in the long hours that these other fellows do.

The WITNESS: No, they do not.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you state that the treatment of your translators of the blue books is better than the treatment accorded translators in the other departments?—A. I should not say it is better, because I think that our hours are much longer in some cases.

Q. During the session?—A. Even after the session. In some cases they are shorter, in others they are much longer. I think it was in 1932, a great number of the members of the staff—I think six or seven translators worked as many as 160 hours of extra work on holidays, in the evenings, and after the regular office hours.

Mr. ERNST: Would you have any record showing the hours of work for the entire year of this staff?

The WITNESS: No. We do not keep any record of that, because it is too irregular, especially during the session.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. To sum up in plain language, you mean that your staff works more during certain times than ordinary civil servants do as a rule?—A. Of course, I do not like to make any comparison.

Q. No, but your hours are longer than those assigned to the ordinary civil service?—A. Certainly.

Q. Therefore, your men are allowed one week more holidays?—A. Yes.

Q. That is the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN: No. It is not the whole thing. He told us very plainly this morning that what he endeavours to do, as chief of the branch, because his men have to work until 6 o'clock and so forth during the session, is to try and make that up to them by letting them away with shorter hours during the recess, and giving them a month's holidays instead of three weeks.

Mr. CHEVRIER: In other words, it evens out.

The CHAIRMAN: He tries to even it up. Mr. Carboneau, we very much appreciate your frankness and your effort to give us a picture of the situation. We may have to ask you to come back some time when some of the members of the committee might want to ask you something else.

The WITNESS: I shall be glad to come back any time.

OMER CHAPUT, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Chaput, I understand that you are the head translator of the Bureau of Statistics?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you a staff under you?—A. I have a staff.

Q. Composed of how many?—A. Composed of one translator and two stenographers.

Q. We are only interested in the translator.—A. I have one translator.

Q. That is Mr. Maubach?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Maubach and yourself then constitute that staff?—A. Yes.

Mr. ERNST: Has he a statement that he wishes to make.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. How long have you been in that position?—A. Eleven years.

By the Chairman:

Q. And were you associated with the service in any way prior to that?—A. Yes, I had been associated with the service. Prior to that I was a newspaper man. I have had twenty-five years of newspaper work, ten years on English papers and fifteen years on French papers.

Q. Had you actually been employed previously to that time as a translator?—A. Yes, in 1913, in the Blue Books branch I was one of the first to be appointed, but I was rather young then and I left the job after a year, because I found it too quiet, and I went back to my newspaper work.

Q. You liked more activity. And have you any matter of your own that you would like to submit to the committee in connection with this Bill before the members of the committee ask you questions in connection with it?—A. I would prefer to be questioned. I have not come to give advice of my own.

Q. No, you have come here because some member of the committee requested that you be summonsed here.—A. Yes, something like that.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Are you one of the four translators that Mr. Bourassa referred to as having translated 1,700 pages in a year?—A. Yes, I am one of them.

Q. Did you give these figures to Mr. Bourassa?—A. No, sir.

Q. As an average estimate of your work, 1,700 pages?—A. It is not an estimate of my work. Mr. Bourassa mentioned it: I think it gives a nice picture for comparison with other departments and other translation branches but is not an estimate of the work done by my branch. These figures, I understand, were taken from the King's Printer's report, covering only the printed translation, which is less than half of the work done by my branch.

Mr. Pouliot: I did not catch that very well.

The CHAIRMAN: The 1,700 pages which Mr. Bourassa mentioned was a figure taken from the King's Printer's report, and it really only represents one-half the amount done by this gentleman and his associates in the Bureau of Statistics.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It is just what is mentioned in the King's Printer's report?—A. Yes, and represents less than one-half of my work.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What other translations do you do?—A. Well, we have all kinds of mimeograph reports and lots of correspondence. Sometimes I have to go through 100 letters a day and mimeographed reports, small reports. We have six mimeographing machines which are always busy, and a good deal of their time is working on French and I have to make all these translations, and one item especially, we have a bureau bulletin which takes an average of 3,000 words a day.

By the Chairman:

Q. That bulletin published by the Bureau of Statistics, do you have to translate that from English into French daily, you and your assistant?—A. Yes, sir, and that is only a drop in the bucket.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You have only two translators?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What would be the total volume of translation in your department in a year?—A. The total volume in a year would be between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 words.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Five million words, what does that mean in pages?—A. Here in the service they call a thousand words a page of Hansard.

By the Chairman:

Q. How many words?—A. A thousand words corresponds to a page of Hansard.

Q. Five thousand pages?—A. Yes, 5,000 pages if it is expressed in terms of pages.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. And how many of a staff did you say?—A. One assistant and myself if you do not want to count my stenographers.

Q. How do the stenographers work?—A. I dictate to them.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Do you write something yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. At times?—A. Well, I have to. Take in the morning, for instance, it takes me fifteen minutes to give one stenographer 3,000, and it takes me another fifteen minutes to give another stenographer 3,000, and after that they go and type it and I take my own typewriter and do some myself.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What would you think would be a fair day's work for a translator?

—A. A fair day's work would be an average of between 3 and 4,000 words a day, which would make about a million words in a year.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is thirty pages?—A. No, 3 pages; three or four pages a day every day.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. How have you managed to accomplish so much more than that?—A. I am no common man.

Q. Your assistant cannot be either?—A. My assistant is a powerful man.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is the work in your department as difficult as the work done in the Blue Books Branch?—A. I should say that no translation is difficult to me, whether it is Blue Books or anything else.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I wish you had not said that. Do you mean to say that you translate 5,000 pages of chemical reports in the year?—A. Anything.

Q. Well then, I would not pay five cents for the book. I am sorry that I have to speak that way but you know better than that. Why do you not stay within the limits of reason? Your work is wonderful work I know, and I have appreciated it, but it is not technical work.—A. It is.

Q. You have mentioned those 1,700 pages, but I am willing to bet you that out of the 1,700 pages one half are figures, one quarter is old text and the other quarter is new text that you translate?—A. I will bring you that if you are interested.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Chairman. We are here—

The CHAIRMAN: I do not like to interrupt. Any member of the committee is at perfect liberty to ask the witness, or any witness that comes here, any question he so desires, but please do not take advantage of your position as a member of the committee to try to destroy a witness by making a statement which the witness has no opportunity of contradicting, such as saying you would not accept the book for anything, and so forth. Let us be fair to the witness who is always at a disadvantage.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not wish to interrupt anybody but I do not see why comments should be passed on my questions before I ask them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It may be proper for the Chairman to say that, but at the same time I am not going to have my good faith impugned in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you the position we are in. We appreciate your work and we know you are a hard worker but here there is no room for exaggeration, we must take things as they are. For instance, I receive every copy of the year book, I read it, I keep it; and also "Canada" 1932, which is translated by you and your staff, and I see in that that there are many things; there is some old text about the history of Canada and some new text, and I would like you to tell the committee the approximate proportion of figures, of old text and new text, that you have to translate for the first time.—A. You mean what is the volume of work in the book.

Q. Yes?—A. Well, there are some reports and figures, tables.

Q. Let us take the Year Book, for instance, it is a big book?—A. 1,176 pages the last issue. There are about four pages of tables.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Figures?—A. And there are about 100 or 150 pages of reprint. Now that would leave something like 700 solid pages. The translator is not only the translator of the book, he is also the editor and the proof reader.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And the reviser?—A. Therefore, whether something is reprinted or not he has to re-edit it again and see the proofs, therefore, it is at least 25 per cent, for a reprint, genuine new text.

Q. Well, do you copy the figures that are in the English text?—A. They are pasted.

Q. Pasted?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, it is less work to paste one page of figures than to copy it?—A. Yes, but we have to read it.

Q. Then you are saved all the trouble you have when you revise it?—A. Yes.

Q. You have to check it?—A. Yes.

Q. For the revising work it is the same thing?—A. Yes.

Q. Because you have to revise the book from the first page to the last?—A. Yes.

Q. But as to translation it is not the same thing?—A. It is not the same thing.

Q. It is easier?—A. It is easier.

Q. And, therefore, in that figure of 1,700 pages there are many hundreds of pages which is revision, figures or tables?

Mr. ERNST: He has already told you 400.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Take the Year Book, for instance?—A. About 400 pages out of the total number.

Q. And for "Canada" each year?—A. "Canada" has hardly any.

Q. It is all text?—A. All text except maybe five or ten pages of figures.

Q. Yes, and is there some old text in those new issues?—A. It is always changed.

Q. But the historical part is the same?—A. No. "Canada" opens with a chapter on the present situation, by a review of the year 1933. The second chapter is a summary of "Canada" from its discovery to the Great War. The next chapter is on population; it is an analysis of the last census on which we have new stuff and new matter every day; and then we have agriculture, all new figures, new comments, and so forth.

Mr. MACINNIS: I do not think we should quarrel with the witness over the statement he has made; he has made a very definite statement, that a fair average translation for a translator would be three or four pages a day.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is your translation all from English into French?—A. No, we have some from French to English; and we also have some from German, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and Greek.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Who does the foreign languages?—A. Mr. Maubach.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is that translation of foreign languages very considerable?—A. Well, I calculate in a year that he had about 200,000 words of foreign language translation most of which was German.

By the Chairman:

Q. By his name he is probably a native German?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do you care to give any opinion as to what improvements might be made in the formation of a Bureau of Translation?—A. I have no hesitation in stating that in my opinion, the way I contemplate it to be, centralization is something that is badly needed for efficiency and for all those concerned, for the equalization of work between the translators, also for better service to the departments, and especially for the public. We translate for the public, and each departmental translator is left in his corner; translation is absolutely seasonal, and one day he has too much work and six weeks later he is waiting for work.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am afraid that if this Bureau of Translation was to improve the efficiency of your office you would probably have 10,000 pages.

Mr. MACINNIS: It might be put the other way about?

The WITNESS: I would be able to draw on the pool and be relieved.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Then you would not have to translate 5,000 pages?—A. I would just work as an ordinary human being.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I can see how you get 5,000 pages.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I understand that you are now overloaded with work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And what amount of pages do you translate each year, that is, your branch, you and your assistant?—A. 5,000,000 words.

Q. And of that there are a certain number of figures which are taken as words?—A. I do not count the tables in that 5,000,000.

Q. You do not count the tables?—A. No.

Q. What amount of pages do you take from the number given by the King's Printer in his report?—A. The King's Printer counted only the printed matter. The mimeograph matter that we issue at the Bureau of Statistics is just as big as what is printed.

Q. I know that, but that is not my question. In the figure given by the King's Printer, he took each page including the pages in which there were figures?—A. Yes.

Q. You say you have more invisible work than visible work?—A. It is about 50-50.

Q. And when you speak about visible work you mention the figures as well as the words?—A. No.

Q. You put aside the figures?—A. I put aside the figures. I allow myself about 25 per cent on that.

Q. You worked for a year in the Blue Book Branch?—A. I did in 1913, yes, sir.

Q. For a year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was the experience that you had in that translation before you came to the Statistical Branch?—A. Yes.

Q. And for eleven years you have been at the Statistical Branch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the experience that you have had as a translator in your own branch?—A. My experience as a translator was not acquired in the government service. I acquired it outside as a newspaper man.

Q. I am asking you questions about your experience in government translation which is very different. You need not discuss your personal experience.

Therefore, the only experience that you have in government translation, outside the year that you spent in the service twenty years ago in the Blue Book Branch, has been in the Statistical Branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Well now, what experience have you in translation in the House of Commons and in other departments of the service?—A. Well, that is a very delicate question. I know of their translation because it is my business to receive it, and the Bureau of Statistics covers all the activities of the other departments, and I have to get all the publications when we have a summary, and if I need the publication I get it from the department.

Q. I have on my desk upstairs the reports received since the beginning of the session, a pile about two feet square. Do you read all that? You are not saying that you read all that?—A. No, life is too short.

Q. You are very well acquainted with your own work?—A. I think so.

Q. And you are superficially acquainted with the outside work?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ask for some extra help?

The CHAIRMAN: Surely that is outside our inquiry?

Mr. POULIOT: No, sir. I will explain to you, Mr. Chairman, what I want to ask him if he has sufficient help to do the work in his department. Surely you will have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN: No, I have no objection.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not adverse to the witness.

The CHAIRMAN: He has already told us that he thinks he is very hard worked, both he and his assistant, and he would like some relief.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You are over-worked?—A. Certainly.

Q. Well now, is there any way of remedying that situation even if there is no centralization of translators?—A. The only way would be to give me more help or send some work outside.

Q. What I want to ask you is this, if you got some more help, some other assistance besides Mr. Maubach, would it be possible for you to work as an ordinary civil servant?—A. Yes.

Q. And, therefore, would there be any need for centralization in that case?—A. It would not work against centralization; it would not affect centralization at all.

Q. No, but from your own point of view, suppose that you required one more man or two more men and they are given to you, would you be in the same position as other translators who work within their regular hours?—

A. If I had two more translators the position would be like this: They would be busy for a part of the year with too much work and then a few months idle. With centralization I would never be overworked and I would never be idle, because I would exchange with other departments.

Q. Provided that the text to be translated comes at different intervals to keep you busy, but have you any certainty or any assurance that the text of all the reports of the government will come down like clock work?—A. I have no certainty that it would or would not.

Q. And without that certainty or that assurance, can you state positively to this committee that what you complain of will be remedied by the centralization of the translation services.

The CHAIRMAN: No he cannot state positively. He is giving his opinion

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You are in favour of co-operation?—A. Yes, and exchange.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Have you asked for some more help?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And was it given to you?—A. Well, not yet.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Did not you get a clerk from one of the other departments?—A. Yes, but he was no help.

Q. Why was he not?

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think you should ask the question, Mr. Chevrier? That is not being fair with the witness.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I am not going to mention any names, but was not that a clerk who had a lot of experience, and who had been very well equipped in another department and gave satisfaction there?

The CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt, don't answer that, witness. We are now considering Bill No. 4. If Mr. Chevrier desires any matter in connection with the civil service examined into as to the erroneous assignment of a qualified man to some particular position, or anything of that kind, he is at perfect liberty to deal with the matter under the other part of our reference. We agreed by common consent that we would stick to Bill No. 4, and I suggest that what you are now asking him is probably covered by our general reference as to civil service matters, but it certainly has no connection with Bill No. 4.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We are talking translation now, Mr. Chairman, and a translator may well be able to translate chemistry, and he may be a most efficient translator in that particular branch, but if he is sent down to do statistical work he may not be fully qualified to do that particular work.

The CHAIRMAN: How does that relate to Bill No. 4?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Because it is translation.

Mr. MACINNIS: Might it not be correct to say, that the reason he did not get the help qualified to do the work was because there was no head connected with the translation work.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You have been working for eleven years at that branch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you admit now that you have more experience than when you started there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore, you have specialized yourself in translation work for the Statistical Branch?—A. Yes, sir. I am learning something new every day.

Q. And you must be given credit for your experience; we admit that you are a good man. But do you mean to say that you can take a translator from any department where he has specialized himself for years and bring him into another department and say that he will be just as efficient?—A. Not as efficient the first few days, but he will become acclimatized shortly. Most of the translators—and I know nearly all of them—are universal men. On top of their general knowledge they may have some specialty, but I think the average translator in any department as well as any parliamentary translator could step into my shoes and do my work to-morrow. He may not be as fast for a week or so but after a while he will come through.

Q. You say a translator is a universal man?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, is he a universal man with a dictionary?—A. Oh hardly.

Q. But if you have a man, for instance, who does translation work for the Public Works Department, translating specifications, accustomed to translate very quickly the description of different pieces of wood, iron, steel, and many other things, which he has at the tip of his fingers, that man can do that work

much easier than say a man in the Department of Agriculture who translates things about sheep and horses?—A. That may be true, but the man who translates specifications can also write something about agriculture, and about imports and exports, and about population, and he can also translate chapters and he can also translate books.

Q. I admit all that, but is not the work done quicker by a man who has specialized in the matter than by a man who has only a general knowledge?—A. I admit that, but because a man is a specialist it does not mean he is negligible in other branches.

Q. Yes, but the work is not done so quickly or so effectively?—A. No.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You know that there are about 90 translators all told in the government services?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you know something about these men and their ability and qualifications?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Assuming then that you require additional assistance in your department, and again assuming that in the aggregate 90 were available for work because they were not pressed with their work at the moment have they, in your opinion, the necessary ability and qualifications to go down there and assist in your bureau?—A. Everyone that I know of.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Except the one that you sent away.

The CHAIRMAN: He did not send a translator away.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It is the case that you were not satisfied with him, the man from another department?—A. I did not say with him. I should have said with her.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have gone further than I have.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, when we meet on Wednesday, 11th April, we will have Mr. Bland who is getting some material requested by members of the committee, and who will probably give us his views on the question of consolidation, or centralization, or whatever you wish to call it. Are there any other witnesses which any member of the committee would like called on this general subject before we get down to consideration of the Bill clause by clause.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Probably some of the Deputy Ministers.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you give us any idea now. I am very much afraid we will have to start holding more than one sitting a week.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would like to have some of the Deputy Ministers called. At the moment I do not want to mention them, but who are in charge of special technical translations. You see, there are various kinds of translation.

The CHAIRMAN: You can give the names to the clerk of the committee during the recess, Mr. Chevrier.

Mr. CHEVRIER: To-day or the day after.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, quite a number of civil service organizations, or their officers, have written me, and I have kept referring their letters and so forth to the clerk of the committee to be brought up for consideration as soon as we dispose of this translation Bill. It is quite apparent to me that we are going to have quite a volume of material to go through and consider, and I think probably we will have to start holding two sittings a week after the Easter recess. Have you gentlemen of the committee any particular day in

the week you would like to sit other than Wednesday which would meet the convenience of everybody, or would you like to hold two sessions on the Wednesday?

Mr. ERNST: I think it would be better to hold two sessions on the Wednesday.

The CHAIRMAN: In future, shall we sit on Wednesday from 11 to 1 and from 4 to 6?

Mr. POULIOT: Starting on Wednesday the 11th?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Agreed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have several individual complaints, Mr. Chairman. Will I turn them over to the clerk?

The CHAIRMAN: What I thought we might do is this: As soon as we dispose of the Translation Bill I was going to bring before the committee the communications received from civil servant organizations dealing with broad matters and then I was going to ask the committee if they wished to hear witnesses in dealing with these individual complaints, because I have received quite a number of them, and I have just kept referring them to the clerk. I think probably if you give your individual complaints to the clerk he will compile a list of them along with those that I have.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will do that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Then we will adjourn now to resume on Wednesday, 11th April, at 11 o'clock in the morning, and we will have two sessions at that time.

The committee adjourned at 1 p.m. to resume on Wednesday, 11th April, 1934, at 11 a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 4

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1934

WITNESS:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 11, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m.

In the absence of Mr. Lawson, Mr. Bowman took the chair.

Members present: Messrs. Bowman, Laurin, Ernst, MacInnis, Pouliot and Chevrier.

Bill No. 4, was again taken under consideration.

The acting chairman read a communication and statement from the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission relative to the examination standing of witness de Martigny. (Letter and Statement set out in Minutes of Evidence hereto.)

E. J. Lemaire, Clerk of the Privy Council, appeared and produced certified copies of several Orders in Council, described in the Minutes of Evidence hereto.

C. W. BLAND, Civil Service Commissioner, was called, examined and retired.

The committee took recess until 4 p.m.

The committee re-convened at 4 p.m.

Mr. Chevrier directed attention to an error in the reported evidence at page 62, line 12, corrected to read "technical reports," printed in error "chemical reports."

Mr. Bland was re-called, examined and retired.

Mr. C. W. Bland; Mr. O. Paradis, Chief of Law Translation Branch; Mr. E. H. Coleman, Under Secretary of State; and Mr. W. S. Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice to be called as witnesses at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, April 18, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

April 11th, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act, met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. L. Bowman, in the absence of Mr. Lawson, presiding:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I have a letter here which I think, in all fairness, should be read into the record. It is a letter addressed to Mr. de Martigny who, you will remember, appeared before the committee as a witness some time ago. I think one of the members of the committee stated that on examination held by the Civil Service Commission Mr. de Martigny stood forty-fifth.

Mr. POULIOT: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt you, but I said there was a rumour to that effect. I did not make the statement as my own.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am sure Mr. Pouliot would be the last to do any injustice to Mr. de Martigny. This letter is dated April 10th, 1934, and is addressed to Mr. de Martigny. It is from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission:

Dear Sir,—I acknowledge reception of your letter of the 9th inst. and I enclose a statement of the marks you have obtained at the examination of parliamentary translator you have passed on December 13th, 1930. Actually you stand third on the list of admissibility. Forty-eight candidates presented themselves at this examination, and, following it, seventeen have been placed on the list of admissibles.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. FORAN,

Secretary, Civil Service Commission.

And the memorandum which accompanied that communication is as follows:—

Statement of marks of the 69th candidates to a competitive examination held the 13th of December, 1930, for the position of parliamentary translator (man) law translation branch, House of Commons, Ottawa.

Subject	Marks obtained	Maxi- mum
Translation from French to English and from English to French	86.15	100

admitted: Yes. Rank: 7th.

Notice: To be admitted one has to obtain 70% of the marks assigned to this examination.

Mr. de Martigny, I would judge, put a memorandum on here in his own handwriting in which he stated that three veterans ranked ahead of him. That is signed by the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, examination division, 10th April, 1934.

Mr. LAURIN: He ranked 7th.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. LAURIN: There were three returned soldiers who have the benefit of 30 per cent, I presume; if there were three returned soldiers ahead of him he should have been ranked fourth.

Mr. POULIOT: If the Chairman had given the witness the opportunity to answer on that he would have given that information. I wanted to have that information from him.

Mr. LAURIN: You declared, of course, Mr. Pouliot that it was only rumour.

Mr. POULIOT: I know that, but we only get this information today. The Chairman ruled my question out of order and, therefore, did not give Mr. de Martigny an opportunity to answer. I am delighted to have that information.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lemaire, Clerk of the Privy Council, is present this morning, and we will now have him produce the documents he was asked to produce.

E. J. LEMAIRE, called.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to produce certain orders in council which I have brought with me. The first one is a certified copy of order in council No. P.C. 2958 of the 16th of December, 1920.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Just briefly, what does that order in council cover, Mr. Lemaire?—
A. That is a regulation of the Civil Service Commission on a question of making temporary employees permanent:

The WITNESS: The next is order in council P.C. 2895, 22nd October, 1921, which amends the previous order in council:

The next order in council that I have is one of the 25th September, 1922, being Item No. 21 of order in council No. 2000. This has reference to Mr. J. P. D. VanVeen, a translator in the Interior Department, granting permanent status to Mr. VanVeen.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What do you say it has reference to?—A. To a particular case, the case of Mr. VanVeen, a translator in the Interior Department.

Then on the 7th August, 1931, I have Item No. 140 of Order in Council 1806, which was passed retiring Mr. VanVeen on account of abolition of position:

On the 31st of August, 1931, an order in council was passed rescinding the order in council which retired Mr. VanVeen.

Then on the 31st August, 1931, an order in council being Item No. 3 of P.C. 2095 was passed recommending that the organization of the Department of the Secretary of State be changed by adding an additional position of principal translator.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. There is no particular name mentioned?—A. No name is mentioned in that order in council.

On the 8th November, 1930, an order in council was passed, Item No. 31 of Order in Council No. 2611:

P.C. 31/2611

The Board recommend that, in accordance with the provisions of section 40 of the Civil Service regulations, authority be granted for the continuance of a temporary position of Senior Translator (INT-ST-3004), for a period of one year from the 8th October, 1930.

There is no name mentioned in that order in council. That is the whole thing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pouliot, I think that you asked that these orders in council be produced. Have you any further questions?

Mr. POULIOT: No, sir.

Witness retired.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bland was requested to be present this morning to make a statement.

C. H. BLAND, recalled.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Are you prepared to make a statement first, Mr. Bland, and then we could probably question you on the statement?—A. Mr. Chairman, I have no formal statement prepared in the matter. I will be glad to attempt to answer the questions of the members of the committee if I can help in any matter; or, if you prefer, there are three or four points I would like to place before the committee.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. This is in connection with translators?—A. In connection with translators, yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Will you be good enough to go ahead, Mr. Bland?—A. There are three or four points, Mr. Chairman, that I thought I would like to place before the committee in connection with the problem of translation. I think we are all agreed, we are all desirous of securing as efficient and effective a translation service in Canada as is possible and, to my mind, there are four problems that deserve consideration in that connection.

In the first place, I think one object we are all anxious to attain is that there should be as ready and as effective a translation service available for all units of parliament and the departments as soon as is possible.

In the second place, I think we will agree that the load of translation should be evened as far as possible among the various translators in the service, both from the point of view of the translators themselves and from the point of view of the service rendered.

In the third place, I think it is desirable that the method of producing translations, apart entirely from the finished product, should be done as economically and effectively as possible so that costs will be kept down to the minimum.

In the fourth place, I think we are concerned in attempting to tie up in as effective a way as possible the times of productions of translations so that they may fit into the operations of the Printing Bureau inasmuch as a great proportion of the translations that are produced are finally issued in printed form.

On these four bases I would like to offer a few thoughts to the committee.

Q. I do not want to interrupt you, Mr. Bland, but could you give the committee just a brief outline of the service as it is at the present time so that we may have the general picture before us, and then perhaps we could follow your points a little better?

Mr. POULIOT: Give us an air view.

The WITNESS: Well, that was exactly what I had in mind.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. I think you were going to do that under each point?—A. I will be glad to do that now for this reason: I think so far, perhaps, the ideas that have been presented to the committee might be said to have been presented from the inside

rather than from the outside, and I think it might be helpful to the committee to have a view of the situation from the outside rather than from the inside. Answering your point, Mr. Chairman, there are at the present time between forty and fifty units, separate units, in the Dominion service. I should judge that probably fifteen or twenty of these have not translators of their own.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What do you mean by a unit?—A. Individual establishments conducting their own business.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. Not necessarily departments?—A. No, not necessarily departments.

Q. Branches of departments?—A. Not necessarily branches of departments, Mr. Ernst. Bureaus, commissions, individual units; there are about forty-five units of that kind, and I do not think it is an unfair statement to say that in the great majority of them the question of translators enters at some time or other.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You take in the House of Commons and Senate in that?—A. I was attempting to deal with the matter on two grounds, Mr. Chevrier. First, on the ground of the needs of parliament and, second, on the ground of the needs of the service proper.

Q. The Administration Branch and then the Legislation Branch?—A. Exactly.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. You state that there are at least fifteen units where there are no translators?—A. I think that is a fair statement, Mr. Laurin, but I would not like to be held too closely to those figures, but there are quite a number that have not translators of their own.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. But all have translation work?—A. The great majority at any rate have. And in connection with the first point I had in mind, it seems to me it is desirable that all units requiring translation services should be able to secure that service as readily and effectively as possible.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. To come back to the question which Mr. Chevrier asked, those 40 to 50 units you have referred to, that does not include the House of Commons or Senate?—A. Well, including the House of Commons and the Senate they perhaps might well be covered by 45.

Q. Then what about the blue book service?—A. I was not differentiating between units of the departments. The situation then at present is roughly this: That certain units are fairly well situated in regard to translation. If they have a matter to translate they have a translator to accomplish the translation. Other units have not, and if they require translation done they must go elsewhere to have it accomplished.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Have you got the names of those in the various units?—A. I was endeavouring to have a statement prepared, Mr. Chevrier, which I hope to have shortly.

Q. Of those that are satisfied and those that are not satisfied?—A. Yes, I will have that thing prepared.

Mr. ERNST: What do you mean by those that are satisfied, those that have translators and those that have not?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The statement that Mr. Bland has just made.

Mr. ERNST: You used the word satisfied. I was wondering whether you meant the departments were satisfied.

Mr. LAURIN: I think he meant there those who have translators.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have had already filed, perhaps you will remember, a list of translators in the public service, first covering the House of Commons and the Senate and then each department. All that has been placed on file.

Mr. POULIOT: I feel this way about it, Mr. Chairman, that those who are satisfied are those who have made no complaints, and those who are not satisfied are those who have made complaints.

The WITNESS: May I make myself clear on the subject; what I was trying to give the committee was a picture of the service as a whole which includes a number of units provided with translators to carry out their translation work and, a number of other units not so provided with translators.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Have you received in the Civil Service Commission complaints from those units on account of the lack of translators?—A. We frequently receive, Mr. Pouliot, requests for services where translators are not available.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. And in such connection?—A. In such connection we have been endeavouring to give the service.

Q. I mean you have no power?—A. Well, it is somewhat difficult under present conditions.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And if you agree to their request they are satisfied?—A. Well, we endeavour to satisfy them.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. You have no power, Mr. Bland, to order a translator in one department to translate for another department, have you?—A. Well, the securing of that type of assistance is largely a matter of request, and sometimes it requires some tact to secure the help required.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. In the departments that have no translators do they go outside the service for translators?—A. I cannot answer that definitely, Mr. MacInnis. The general practice, I think, is to go to the House of Commons Blue Book section for assistance. There may be cases where it is necessary to go outside, but as to that I cannot say.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: All right, go ahead, Mr. Bland.

The WITNESS: Proceeding from that point, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the committee must be interested in the problem, in the best method of making available for all units—whether they have translators or not—the necessary facilities for translation service as required. That seems to be fundamental, and as I have pointed out, at present it is somewhat difficult where the unit does not include translators, to give them immediate service when translation is required. Some times that service has been provided by the

House of Commons Blue Book section, but it is not a complete solution of the situation.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In connection with those units that have no translating service, the commission has no power or authority to furnish them with translators unless they ask for them?—A. Oh, no. The commission never furnish employment to anyone unless it is asked for.

Q. I mean you have been occasionally asked to furnish a translator, but you have never been requested by any department to establish a translator in a unit where there was no translating branch?—A. Oh, yes. I think that has taken place, Mr. Chevrier. If a department feels it is going to have permanent work I think it has quite normally asked the commission through the Translator Board to establish the position of translator.

Q. And you have established it?—A. Yes.

Q. In other words, you have established it at any time that you have been requested and it has been warranted?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, you have not been requested by those 15 units to establish translators there?—A. I think it is obvious, Mr. Pouliot, that in many cases it would not be warranted to establish a permanent position because the work might only be part-time work.

Q. That is not my question, Mr. Bland. I asked you if you had been requested by those 15 or 20 units that have no translators to give them translators?—A. I do not think so. By quite a number of units we have not been so requested.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. But there might be casual work?—A. There is casual work.

Q. That would have to be done?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, when there is temporary work for a translator, work not extending over a very long period, is it done at times by the clerks and stenographers in the office without the assistance of any special translator?—A. Well, I suppose we might distinguish between the two types of translation work. It might perhaps be routine translating of correspondence which is ordinarily done by the stenographers or clerks, that is, the bilingual stenographers or clerks.

Q. And sometimes by the bilingual officials themselves?—A. Yes. I was referring more to what I think might be called the real translation itself, the technical translation.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. The main point is, there is no systematic way of doing it for those units at the moment?—A. That is right.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Apparently there is not sufficient work to warrant the establishment in that branch of a permanent translating branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Or because the department itself or unit has not requested the establishing of it?—A. Yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Before we get away from that, Mr. Bland, in these units where you have translators, what is the authority over them, a uniform authority or who exercises control?—A. The Deputy Minister of the Department.

Q. The Deputy Minister of the Department?—A. Yes.

Q. Are all the appointments that you have referred to in the different departments under the Civil Service Commission?—A. No, not necessarily. If a translator were appointed in a unit of the service that is exempt from the Civil Service Act a translator for that unit would not be under the Civil Service Commission.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. As, for instance, Income Tax?—A. Yes, Income Tax. In answering your question a little more fully, Mr. Chairman, as to uniformity of control, there is control by the head of the department, but there is no uniformity of control in the sense of uniformity of procedure or uniformity of assistance, if you like. That is one of the problems, you will remember, that was raised by this committee two years ago, the question of utilization of staff that were not necessarily employed full time, rather than taking on new employees.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. For instance, in the Trade and Commerce Department, there is Mr. Letellier, under the jurisdiction of Mr. Parmalee, the Deputy Minister, and at the same time the translators in the Statistical Branch, who are not in the same building, are under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Minister?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Just on that point, you say you have two translators, one in the East block in the Department of Trade and Commerce and one in the National Research Bureau?

Mr. POULIOT: No, the Statistical Bureau.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. All right, the Bureau of Statistics. Now, where they do special work, where both of them do special work, would it be feasible to have that work done as effectively by taking them away from there and putting them into the Confederation building or some other building under one roof with the rest of the translators?—A. I do not think it would be an efficient move to remove a specialist from his own particular work.

Q. I will go into that later.—A. There are, of course, many translators who are not specialists.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You said at the outset, Mr. Bland, that you did not have any prepared statement. Would you be good enough to let us have a little later on a statement setting forth the number of translators that go to make up these units?

Mr. ERNST: We had that filed last day, Mr. Chairman.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I know, but it does not cover all the information. I want the salary, the kind of translation that has been done, and the average service in each department over a certain period, so that we may follow your testimony and have the picture before us.—A. Yes, I will be glad to do that. I would like to just develop that theme a little. As I said before, the committee in 1932 suggested that one of the desirable things the commission could do would be to endeavour to make the service more elastic by moving employees to and fro rather than adding to the service. As a matter of fact, that is something the commission has been trying to do with some degree of success in the last

year, and one of the problems that has arisen in that connection is the problem of translation services. It is only one of many. The same thing applies very forcibly in the stenographic service, and I think it is very desirable that the best possible means should be developed, where services are required, for that service to be furnished.

Q. At the time that one department might be asking for the services of a translator, for instance, another department might have a man who has nothing to do, or very little to do, who might be available for that service?—A. The idea is to provide the service wherever possible, and do it so that the best of harmony will prevail in the various departments concerned.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The kind of translation varies with each department?—A. Oh, yes. That is one of the difficulties. As a rule, it is seasonal too, and that also is one of the difficulties that needs correction. Translation work has its peaks and its hollows, and if reasonable means can be found whereby these peaks can be removed, at least partially—

Q. You say, Mr. Bland, that it is seasonal?—A. Yes.

Q. It is not seasonal in all departments?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Because in some departments there is regular work done by the translators?—A. Yes. I would not say it was always seasonal, but there is a seasonal factor in it.

Q. In some units they work overtime?—A. Quite.

Q. For quite a long period in the year?—A. That is one of the difficulties we would like to remove if at all possible.

Q. But you admit it is impossible to remove it completely, Mr. Bland?—A. Quite. We are only hoping to ameliorate it.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. The fluctuations are more pronounced in translation work than possibly clerical or stenographic work?—A. I think perhaps a situation has been built up,—I won't say it has been built up by any one person, but it has developed through time in the translation service more so than in the clerical service. It is an easy matter to move a clerk; if a department needs three or four extra clerks for a rush period it is not a difficult matter to secure these clerks and move them over, but it is not as easy to move them in the translation service.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Because it is of a special nature?—A. Yes.

Q. Sort of technical?—A. Yes. I think that covers the first point that I have in mind, that is, the necessity or the desirability at any rate for providing as ready and as efficient a translation service as possible for all units, both parliamentary and departmental.

Q. Before you leave that point, Mr. Bland, you say that you want an efficient and effective system. You have already stated that a specialist should not be disturbed from the department, or the branch or the unit that he is in. That would imply that those who are not specialists might be disturbed from the place where they work. Could you say how many are not specialists—

The CHAIRMAN: Just pardon me for interrupting, Mr. Chevrier. I do not quite understand that Mr. Bland went quite that far.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh yes, he said that a specialist should not be disturbed.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Do you agree with that or do you not?—A. I would like to answer that this way, Mr. Chevrier; I think an efficient superintendent of translation would

bear carefully in mind the problem of when it was desirable to move or whether it was not desirable to move specialists in translation. I think that is one of the major problems in the situation; but there may be times when a specialist is not employed full time and that specialist without being moved at that particular time might conceivably give very useful assistance in other than specialist translation to some other department.

Q. That is just the trouble; that is the whole gist of this Bill; that is the whole difficulty in this Bill and the sooner we get to it the better off we will be. I cannot think of a specialist or a man who has specialized in biology, for instance, a highly technical translator or, for that matter, a law translator, being removed from his particular work to help in another department; I cannot think of any good purpose that is likely to be achieved by taking him away from the translation of biology or from the translation of law to translate poultry husbandry or something of that kind. That is the whole of my difficulty, I cannot see that that can be done.—A. I do not think I have made myself clear, Mr. Chevrier, because either we are thinking about a different thing or else we are not thinking about the same method of solution. It seems to me it is conceivable that a specialist, we will say, in biology would not reasonably be expected to move away from that biological translation; it would not be good business; but I think he might conceivably have a certain amount of time at his disposal when he was not busy on that biological translation, which time might profitably be spent for translation work of a general nature.

Q. Just to follow that up, that is the whole concern in this Bill, that is what I am concerned about, and I understand from the statements that have been made by the Minister in the House, and the statements that have been made here by the Chairman, and the very alarming statement made by Mr. Ernst that they would all be removed—

Mr. ERNST: I did not.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh, yes.

Mr. ERNST: No, no. I said I could not conceive that they would all be left where they are.

Mr. CHEVRIER: All right, but that is my difficulty. If you have specialists in these various units how can those specialists, or how can this centralization bureau work out if you say that the superintendent will very likely not disturb any of the experts because it would not be good business; that would not be centralization; that would be leaving them exactly where they are. I might go this far with you, that there may be room for improvement, but I cannot see that you can proceed in such a radical way as this Bill would lead me to believe is likely to happen, and up to the moment at any rate I do not know how it is going to work out. At page 16 of Hansard the Minister said:—

On review of the matter it was recommended, first by the Civil Service Commission that, to avoid the appointment of a number of translators in addition to the number I have mentioned, and in view of the fact that a consolidation had been made under the Minister of Finance of the accounting systems of the different departments, a bureau might be created to which the existing translators would be attached, subject to the Civil Service Commission in every respect, which could be called upon authoritatively to translate State documents as from time to time throughout the year they may be required.

The WITNESS: I think probably reference was made there, Mr. Chevrier, to the report made in 1924, the Senate committee. If copies of that report have not been distributed I will be glad to distribute them.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Has the Civil Service Commission gone into this matter recently for the purpose of making any recommendations as to how this bureau could be set up?—A. What I must try to do, I think, Mr. Chevrier, is to give you my ideas of how the thing would work rather than endeavour to lay down exactly what is intended. I can only give you my ideas on it.

Q. My difficulty is to know how you get those ideas. Did you make a survey of it with a view to making a special report to someone within the last year or so?—A. Perhaps I should go back a little further on it, but there is one point I would like to make clear, Mr. Chevrier. I think we have a different conception of how the Bill is going to work.

Q. I have no conception at all except that I am afraid of it. I cannot see how it is going to work.—A. Here is the point I would like to make clear on that particular branch.

Q. If you and I sat down and worked out regulations I think we could come to a solution, but I cannot discuss this Bill unless I know more about it.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Is it not a setting up process, Mr. Bland, is that not behind the Bill?—A. I think so. I would like to give Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Pouliot this conception. There is, I think, a difference between the idea of centralization alone and the idea of co-ordination of services.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is it not this way: The bureau does not necessarily mean the centralization of translators in one particular place, but it does mean the centralization of translation?

MR. POULIOT: Yes, but if you take it this way, if the translators are left where they are now, and there is a general superintendent of translation that gentleman will have to cover those 45 units by aeroplane daily.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, if I might be permitted to make a suggestion. I think we could consider this Bill as being a co-ordination of services rather than the consolidation or amalgamation of personnel. If we did that I think we might get somewhere on it.

MR. CHEVRIER: That is lovely and I will probably be the first one to jump at that if you, Mr. Chairman, can show me any place where we can tie it down to that. If we can tie it down to co-ordination of some kind, all right, I will discuss it right now; but the principle of this Bill is purely one of centralization. I would like someone in authority to tell me just how this Bill is going to work out.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I would like to ask you a question, Mr. Bland: From your experience in the Civil Service Commission, will you please tell us if the Civil Service Commission could not do that supervision and co-ordination if asked to do so by the government?—A. I think if the authority were given and it is provided in this Bill it could be done.

Q. Yes, if the Civil Service Commission is asked to do that by the government it can do it?—A. The whole question, Mr. Pouliot, I think, is one of authority. As I said, we have not been attempting to give service in this way during the past year.

Q. I know, Mr. Bland, but I did not ask you about authority.—A. I think authority is the chief point.

Q. I made a distinction between authority and the capacity to do it. I will make it clear: At present, the Civil Service Commission does not do that because it is not asked to do it by the government, but on the other hand if the government asks the Civil Service to do that, either by a Bill or an Order in Council, or anything else, is the Civil Service Commission able to do that work without a superintendent?—A. Oh, I think a general superintendent would be necessary.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think section 3 of the Bill sets out definitely the intention of the Bill.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, you have now the files of most of the translators of the Civil Service Commission, you have the case of each one. What I ask you is, is the Civil Service Commission able to do that co-ordination and supervision in such a way as to be able to give ready and effective service for all units and all departments and even the load of translation between all translators, and to make the method of producing translation as economical and effective as possible?—A. I think a supervisor would be necessary to achieve results.

Q. But at present is there not a supervisor in each department, for instance, the Deputy Minister?—A. That is just the difficulty, Mr. Pouliot, there are so many supervisors at the present time that there is no co-ordination.

Q. But there is a chief in each branch who is responsible I take it in this way: Here is a man who is a translator, he is responsible to his chief, the chief of the branch, and the chief of the branch is responsible to the Deputy Minister, therefore, the translator is responsible directly to his chief and indirectly to the Deputy Minister, and the Deputy Minister has control, to decide anything that has to be done in the department, under the orders of the Minister, that is the way it goes, Mr. Bland?—A. Yes, that is true, Mr. Pouliot, but I think you need to go a step further.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. Each department at the moment is water-tight and you need to have some means of connection between the two?—A. I think there has to be some co-ordination of some kind in this case, between the superintendent and the translator.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. If co-ordination is brought about there will only be the matter of supervision?—A. Well, I imagine it would be the supervisor's job to get the machine running properly.

Q. Taking up the fourth point that you mentioned, Mr. Bland—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Why not take them in order, Mr. Pouliot?

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Bland mentioned it and I have just one question to ask him about it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, you mentioned timing of translation in order that translation work would go just like clockwork.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If you will follow that number four further, it says with the idea of working in co-ordination with the Printing Bureau.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. This is just a matter of co-ordination, timing, the moment when reports to be translated are distributed amongst the translators, is that it?—A. I think there is a bit more than that to it, Mr. Pouliot. To co-ordinate that work properly a man must not only be a good administrator but he must be a good translator too.

Q. I know, but what I am going to ask you is this: You have now a superintendent of translation, let us say; his first duty would be to supervise the way the translation is done and to co-ordinate the translation amongst the different departmental branches, but as well to time up the moment when the reports are given to the translators, and does that mean that the general superintendent will have to interfere with the departmental business?—A. No. I should not use the word “interfere.” I do not think it will be a process of interference; I think it will be a process of co-operation.

Q. Well, co-operation, but he will have to see the Deputy Minister of each department concerned, or the chief of each branch concerned and say to him “your report on such and such a matter will have to be ready on such and such a day in order to be delivered to such and such a group of translators”?—A. I think on the whole, Mr. Pouliot, that the Deputy Ministers and the chiefs of branches would be only too ready to co-operate with an efficient superintendent.

Q. Yes. Then if there is co-operation the general superintendent will have no authority over the distribution of work in each department to the translators?—A. Well, he would have quite a large measure of authority under this Bill.

Q. Then he will interfere with the departmental business?—A. If he is a good man he won't.

Q. How will he do it, I cannot understand it very well.

Mr. MACINNIS: He is going to be a man of intelligence.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Just right on what you have said, Mr. Bland, about co-ordination, and evidently you have given that matter considerable thought; I am quite prepared to listen and have you give me an explanation as to the way in which you think the present Bill will work out in the light of co-ordination. I will be grateful if you will start right from the beginning and show me how you think this Bill will work out, start from the top and go right down and show how this will work out, how this co-operation should be done, because up to the present time I have had no light at all on the subject?—A. I will be glad to do that, Mr. Chevrier, but I wonder if you mind if I finish up this general survey?

Q. All right.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Bearing in mind this, of course, Mr. Chevrier, that I do not know just how far we could press Mr. Bland on that point; that is, how we are going to set up a department if the Bill goes through.

Mr. CHEVRIER: This would not be binding.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It would be a sort of general statement.

Mr. POULIOT: It is just as a matter of explanation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I know, as a general statement.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It must be understood that it would not be binding on anybody. I want to see how anybody can understand this thing.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, I will tell you why I asked that question; it is because to even the load of translation because, as you said in number 2, you thought it necessary to tie up the delivery of the translation and there was some connection between number 2 and number 4.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Having had Mr. Pouliot's one question asked, go ahead, Mr. Bland.

The WITNESS: Coming back then, Mr. Chairman, to the second point, that is, of endeavouring to even the load among translators, I think that is a reason-

able consideration to take into account, and the situation at present is this: That under the pressure of peak loads or certain circumstances, some of the translators are forced to work overtime and perhaps endeavour to get things through too quickly under pressure, and my idea is that with proper co-ordination assistance might be given that particular unit at its peak load so that the whole thing would be evened up, so to speak, and the translators as a whole would not be forced to work with peaks at one time and lapses at another but on a more even basis. I think that would be a good thing if it could be accomplished.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That is number 2?—A. That is number 2. Number 3 is the question of the most economical and effective method of producing the translation, and I think I tried to distinguish between the methods of production and the quality of the finished product. I am not referring to the quality of the finished article in translation. I have in mind the means by which that finished product is produced. At the present time, in the 20 or 25 units in which there are translators there is more or less individual control in the methods used to produce translation. In some cases translations may be made from the original copy and issued in printed form; in other cases they may be made from typewritten copy; in other cases they may be made from galley proofs, and in other cases they may be made from page proofs. In other words, there is a diversity of methods of production in different units. Some of those are obviously more expensive than others.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Taking that point, Mr. Bland, if the matter is carefully looked into by the Civil Service Commission the commission can offer suggestions to the translators in that respect?—A. I think you are putting the Civil Service Commission in the place of the superintendent of the Translation Bureau, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. No, no. I asked if the Civil Service Commission can do that effectively and efficiently?—A. I do not think it can do it as efficiently or effectively without the help of the superintendent.

Mr. McINNIS: Would not that be interfering with the work of the translators?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Of the departments?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now sir, coming to that, there are elementary things that could be done even without a superintendent. I am informed that in some branches some reports are sent in French, translated into English and then translated again into French instead of using the first French text. It is not necessary to be a genius to tell them to use the French text instead of translating the English into French in that case?—A. If that is done at the present time, Mr. Pouliot, it is a pretty good example of what happens when you have not got co-ordination.

Q. I understand that very well, but this is a thing that could be remedied too by the commission.—A. Of course, I may be wrong in this, I do not know the legal phase of it, but I imagine if the necessity for the bureau arose from the fact that it involved parliamentary translation as well as departmental—

Q. Mr. Bland, you will admit that translation is like everything else, it must be based on common sense?—A. Yes, indeed. I think that would be one of the chief ingredients in the success of the administration.

Q. Common sense is the basis of all organizations.—A. There is a great diversity of procedure in the production of translation in the various units.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is that not dependent upon the nature of the particular work?—A. To a certain degree, Mr. Chevrier, but it goes beyond that particularly.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Even in the ordinary mechanics of the translation there is a vast diversity too, is there not?—A. Quite. I would like to make it clear that I am not referring to the technique of translation. I am referring to what might be called the routine or the office procedure of handling translations. Now, if that can be, through the exercise of common sense, put on some co-ordinated basis, and a more economic basis, there is no doubt in my mind that you will have less expense in translation, you will have better translation, and you will have translations available at an earlier date.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If that was in this Bill I would agree to it at once.

The WITNESS: That is what is hoped will be the result of the Bill.

Mr. ERNST: How can you put details in a Bill?

Mr. CHEVRIER: We have had Bills drawn up before that showed the whole machinery of them.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chevrier, I am trying to give you an idea of the service as it is at the present time, and I think perhaps you have agreed with me so far that the things I have stated are some of the needs.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. No doubt there is room for improvement. However, go ahead.—A. I think that finished number three. The next is number four, and while this may seem to be outside the field of this particular Bill I think myself it has a very important connection. The great proportion of the translated product of the various departments certainly appears in printed form, and at the present time the difficulty is that a great deal of that product goes to the printing bureau at one season, and usually it is the peak season, in other words, the parliamentary session. If the work can be arranged so that it will be timed in order that it will appear at regular intervals throughout the year it will be of great advantage to the printing bureau particularly in the off season, and also it will be of great advantage to the bureau in the peak season. At the present time they find great difficulty, except at the expense of fairly high overtime, in carrying the load at all.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. If the Deputy Ministers gave more attention, or closer attention to that particular feature of the work, that could be done without this Bill?—A. Well, Mr. Chevrier, one difficulty in that connection, I think, is this: As you know, translation is a specialized function, and it is a rather difficult thing, to my mind, for the Deputy Minister of the department, loaded as he is with all the detail and the administration of the department, to attempt to co-ordinate the actual production process of that technical thing known as translation. I have no doubt he would like to do it but it is impossible for him to do it.

Q. It would not be difficult for him to say to those charged with the production of the various reports, this English report must be translated at such and such a time in order to help out the printing bureau?—A. I think probably most deputy ministers have done that. I think that has probably been an understood thing to ease off the strain, but the fact is it is not done.

Q. Then would the superintendent have more authority than the deputy minister?—A. Naturally the deputy minister would be the head, but if the superintendent is a good one he could see that that particular phase of the co-ordination is carried out.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. What do you mean by a good one?—A. A man who can produce better translation, the very best possible translation.

Q. Oh no, not that, Mr. Bland. You said a superintendent, if he is a good one, what do you mean by that?—A. I think a good superintendent of translation in this case will be a man who will produce the best possible translation at the lowest possible cost and with the best results to the people that need it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In other words, one that will exercise common sense.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well sir, I have this to ask you: Here is a translator who is specialized in a certain kind of translation; will you admit that he will do better work in a shorter space of time than a specialist in another branch of translation?—A. I am afraid I cannot answer that, Mr. Pouliot. I am not sufficiently expert in it.

Q. Well, for instance, better work in a shorter space of time than one who is not a specialist in the matter?—A. That would be a question, I think, if it were put up to the Civil Service Commission, we would have to go to the superintendent of translation and get his advice on it.

Q. It comes in in connection with the time of delivery of translation, and it all depends; if one man is a specialist he would not have to look at the dictionary so often as one who has no knowledge of the particular matter which is to be translated?—A. Quite.

Q. And he will have a better understanding of the text he has to translate, and he will do much better, cleaner, quicker and more effective work, and moreover, sir, you will admit there will be less erasings?—A. Oh, I think that is quite true, Mr. Pouliot. I think that would be one of the objects to be achieved.

Q. And, therefore, it will be economical from the point of view of the work done by that man, and from the point of view of the cost to the printing bureau also?—A. I am glad you raised that point, because I forgot to mention that, and that is a very important factor—the variations in the methods of production at the present time, some from typewritten copy, some from galley proofs, some from page proofs, some from printed reports means that in the year—I think it was in the year 1932 it was estimated that approximately \$75,000 was the cost of corrections in the printed copy.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Corrections alone?—A. Yes, corrections alone.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That was in the translation into French only?—A. Oh, no, English and French. Of course, the great bulk of it was French.

Q. By the very nature of things?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And it included also the cost of corrections of speeches printed at the request of the members?—A. Well, the total cost, I presume.

Q. And putting into page all those speeches?—A. The reason I mention that is because I wanted to show the cost of the present method, the present diversity of method of production, what it amounts to.

Q. Yes, but that is also based on common sense?—A. Oh yes, common sense enters into it.

Q. And you know very well that the cheapest form of correction is on typewritten pages, and then on galley proofs, and, of course, it is more expensive when the matter is in page?—A. Quite. That is just the difficulty. A certain amount of it at the present time is corrections on page form.

Q. Yes, and therefore, it is to be presumed that when a man is an expert in some matter, when he has a real knowledge of his particular kind of translation, there are less erasures in his copy than if the translation were performed by another expert?—A. I should think that would be true.

Q. And it is easier also for the composer at the printing bureau to do his job, he takes less time when he has clean copy?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Bland, you said there were \$75,000 in corrections. Is there any detail available as to that?—A. Yes, I think I can get that for you.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. With regard to that last item of yours, Mr. Bland, the time of production to fit in with the operations of the printing bureau, at the present time what is the general practice; for instance, start with this question in the first place, getting out the blue books for most of the departments how long after the English finished product blue book comes out does, as a general rule, the translation in French come out?—A. Well, it is altogether too long a subsequent period. I think perhaps Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Pouliot will have that information better than I have, because I imagine there must be a good deal of criticism and objection to a translation that comes out a year or two years after the original.

Q. Well, had you in mind that when you were making your recommendation under number 4?—A. Oh yes, that is what I had in mind, that there should be some co-ordinated effort or common sense effort to bring these things about so as to both help the printing bureau in its production and to get them out as soon as possible for the people that need them. There is not much use bringing out a translation two or three years after the original.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In other words, this Bill would be more directed toward the mechanical side of the translation, that is, the manner in which the translation should be produced; as you very aptly said at the start you were not concerned with the finished product but only the manner in which that product was being produced, and that manner should be the most economical?—A. Of course, I would like to temper that slightly. I am concerned with the finished product, Mr. Chevrier, but I am not referring to it because I think that is a technical matter that I would not feel competent to speak on.

Q. That is the way I understood it, Mr. Bland, and that is the way I want to argue it out with you; but this is directed, at least more attention should be given to the mechanical side. Every objection that I have found up to the moment is on the mechanical side. I have not yet heard one complaint about the nature of the translation or the finished product. I have heard no complaint up to the moment in that regard, but I have heard a lot of complaints as to how that product is being produced, and mechanically that ought to be produced more economically.—A. That was the thought I was trying to convey.

Q. In that I am highly interested, and if this Bill will help in any way then all right, there is that feature to it that would be good, but I cannot see it yet. I cannot see how this Bill is going to achieve that, but if somebody shows me how then all right.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. For instance, Mr. Bland, a deputy minister brings down a certain blue book from his department; is it, as a general rule, first brought down in English, the report which is finally put out in the blue book?—A. I speak subject to correction again by Mr. Chevrier and Mr. Pouliot, but I think that would be a fair statement. As a general rule it is brought down in English first.

Q. And then subsequently after it has been brought down in English it is at a later date translated into French and a French edition comes down?—A. Yes. I think probably the answer is that it would be translated at as early a date as possible after the English edition has come down.

Q. After the finished product in English?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, is there any reason why the deputy in bringing down that report should not bring it down in duplicate or triplicate, or as many copies as may be desired, so that it could be worked at right from the start in both English and French so that you would have perhaps the finished edition in English and French brought down at practically the same time?—A. That is the object towards which I think the system might work; that is what I had in mind.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The question is this, Mr. Bland, all departments publish many reports and you are probably supplied each year with a copy of the reports which have to be published in accordance with the law. Would it be possible to time up the translation of those reports which are sent to the Governor General on the same day at the expiration of the fiscal year, on the 31st of March? All those reports are sent to the Governor General at the same time. How would it be possible to arrange it so that they are translated at one and the same time? It is impossible?—A. Under present conditions I think it is impossible to have them all done at the same time. Some reports, however, are not issued as of March 31st. For example, the report of the Civil Service Commission is December 31st.

Q. But most of the reports are presented to the Governor General on the 31st of March each year?—A. I agree that it would be impossible to get them all out at the same time while the present system is in existence.

Q. That is a matter that should be decided by the government and not by the superintendent?—A. That is, the date of the issuing of the reports?

Q. Yes.—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And you admit, Mr. Bland, that most reports are presented to the Governor General on that date?—A. I think that something might be done though to separate, to a certain degree, the printed matter, and I would imagine that a good superintendent with common sense again, would suggest that very thing.

Q. But it would not be done by the superintendent, it would be done by the government?—A. Quite so.

Q. Therefore, even if there is no superintendent and if there is an agreement between each branch and the government the matter can be done without the assistance of a superintendent?—A. It could.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Mr. Bland, just to cover the point raised by Mr. Pouliot, to carry that a little farther, take for instance the reports for the fiscal year 1932-33, they are by statute, as a general rule, required to be filed at the opening of the House or within a certain number of days afterwards, that is, the reports for 1932-33 would be filed at the opening of the House this present session, 1934, so that there is the whole of the intervening summer in which the translating and printing of those reports is being done?—A. That is right.

Q. Consequently, if the suggestion which I made were followed a great deal of the work could be done simultaneously?—A. I think so.

Q. And with the object in view of having the French and English reports, or blue books, coming down a little more closely together.—A. And the committee, of course, will keep in mind also that there is a tremendous amount of translation, many bulletins and publications issued in both languages, and they are the ones frequently in which there is so much delay.

Q. If that were done then during the summer time prior to the sitting of the House that would obviate a further load being put on the Printing Bureau during the session?—A. That is the idea, yes.

Q. The time that the peak load is carried by the Printing Bureau is during the actual sitting of the House?—A. Yes.

Q. And if that work of translation and preparation of the blue book generally could be done prior to the sitting of the House then there would be less necessity for additional employees in the printing bureau and overtime during the session, and generally the expense involved in the carrying of the peak load would be obviated?—A. And there would be another desirable feature too, that is, during the off season there would be enough work to carry the staff of the printing bureau.

Q. Yes, I am very glad you mentioned that. At the present time in certain of the departments I presume, of necessity, some of the translators have to be laid off?—A. I was thinking more of the printing bureau. The printing bureau staff must, if it is going to keep going properly, function fairly steadily all the time. If you do not do that you have to lay people off and then take other people on when there is a peak or a heavy load.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. When they issue or produce a report in English, would it not be feasible to do this: A chapter is finished in a book or in a report, it has a certain number of pages; if it is a report without chapters it has a certain number of pages; these pages are finished in the English language. Why should not that immediately be turned over to the translators so that they could translate so many pages or chapters of that report, and as the pages are being translated they could be produced and printed and the reports come out concurrently or nearly so. As I understand it now, they wait until the report is finished and then they turn it over to someone and say "go ahead and translate this"?—A. There is one difficulty in the way of that, generally speaking, although that is the thing that should be done. Quite frequently there are a number of changes made by the author or editor of the report, and there would have to be constant working together between the French and English sections.

Q. They could get down to a system, however, whereby that chapter would be closed subject probably to some slight alterations?—A. Quite so. I think that is the thing that should be done.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. And you have in mind, Mr. Bland, that that is one of the main objects that might be accomplished by a bureau such as is proposed to be set up?—A. These are the things that appear to me to be the most necessary, and that is the way they appear to me they could be done.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, do you believe that the translation in one department should be under the control of the deputy minister of that department, or that the deputy minister should have control over it?—A. The superintendent?

Q. No. I will ask the reporter to repeat the question:

(Reporter repeats question.)

A. I am not sure that I quite follow that question, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Well, my idea is this, Mr. Bland, take the deputy minister of any department, a translator does some work, is it important for him to have control over that work?—A. Yes, I think that work must be satisfactory to the deputy minister or it is no good.

Q. Yes. Therefore, the deputy minister hands it to the minister who subsequently hands it to his Excellency and, therefore, the deputy minister is responsible to the minister for that translation, and if the translation comes under the jurisdiction of the general superintendent both of them will be responsible to the minister, and if there is a mistake who will be blamed for it?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, there will be a responsible minister in charge of the bureau, responsibility would exist.

Mr. POULIOT: The conflict then would not be between the deputy minister and the superintendent but between the two ministers?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, Mr. Bland, there are times when the translators of the House of Commons and the Senate are very busy, that is, during the session. Is it possible for them to do any outside translation at such a time?—A. I should imagine at that particular time they might need some help.

Q. Yes, but as they work 12 hours a day and more, as Mr. Gerin said the other day, it would be impossible for them to take on extra work. Therefore, may I ask you now if in the units where they have translators the reports of those departments or units are translated by those translators to the unit?—A. The reports in a good many cases of the individual units are translated by the blue book section of the House. In certain cases they are translated by the departmental or unit translators; in other cases they are translated by the blue book translators.

Q. I would like to ask you something else, Mr. Bland about the blue book translators. Do you know that the Finance Department sends some translation to the blue book department, or did?—A. Yes.

Q. And do you know on the other hand, that the translation work of the Tariff Board is done by the Post Office Department translators, and that the Tariff Board is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do you not think it would be a good thing to get those things straightened out and have them all under one authority.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Would it be better to have it under the authority of the Minister of Finance and to have a translator there in the Department of Finance to do the work of the Tariff Board and the work of the Department of Finance, and would it not be proper to send one of the translators of the blue book branch to the Department of Finance, one or two as the case may be?—A. I am glad you raised that point, Mr. Pouliot, because I think it is quite conceivable that as far as might arise wherein a superintendent might think it was desirable and warranted that he should report that a permanent translator should be attached to a particular department—it might be the Department of Finance as in this case—depending on the circumstances. I would not want it to be thought that there should be a permanent office established unless it were warranted by future developments.

Q. Therefore, Mr. Bland, do you admit that the work of all the branches of one department should be under the jurisdiction of the deputy minister who submits that work to the minister?—A. I think the work of all branches of a department must obviously be satisfactory to the deputy minister of that department.

Q. In connection with the matter of co-ordination, in having all the work of the Tariff Board done by a translator of the Finance Department under the control of the deputy minister of that department, and all the work besides that of the department being done under the jurisdiction of the deputy minister, will you please tell me if the superintendent will have anything more to do if it is done as a matter of co-ordination?—A. Do you mean with the finished product?

Q. No, with the organization; the organization or co-ordination is only temporary.

Mr. ERNST: Oh no, how about evening work.

Mr. POULIOT: My good friend Mr. Ernst did not catch what I meant.

Mr. ERNST: I catch what you mean but I do not agree with you, put it that way. What you mean is that you do not want this Bill to pass.

Mr. POULIOT: No no, I want this Bill to pass as a finished product.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, what I would like to know from you is this, there is a matter of co-ordination which is important, we admit that, to a certain extent but not so far as some others do, however, to a certain extent.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Co-ordination is incidental to certain things.

Mr. POULIOT: Co-ordination with efficiency.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, and economically.

Mr. POULIOT: If I am satisfied that the Bill means that then I will be ready to support it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, what I want to know is this, that as far as co-ordination goes the work of the superintendent in such a case, if the matter is confined necessarily to the work of the Tariff Board and the work of the Department of Finance, that is, in translation matters, done by translators of the Finance Department under the control of the deputy minister—that is merely a supposition— —A. Take that situation as you outline it, Mr. Pouliot, it seems to me what happens at the present time is that the chairman of the Tariff Board finds that he requires translation work to be done and having no translator he is forced to the necessity of securing a translator from another department, or even in some other department other than that which he is connected with—in this case he has had to get assistance from the Post Office Department and have the work done there.

Q. Then he has been wandering for help?—A. Yes.

Q. He has been wandering for help because there was no translator for the Department of Finance?—A. Exactly.

Q. And if they had had a sufficient staff in the Department of Finance it would not have been necessary for the Tariff Board to send the translation to the Post Office Department.

Mr. MACINNES: There is another side to that, Mr. Chairman, that is, if the Post Office Department is able to do the Tariff Board's work then they would be doing nothing in their own department at that time, and still would be doing nothing if there was a translator at the Department of Finance. You are making out a very good case for the Bill.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And, therefore, the translators of the Post Office Department who are under the control of the Postmaster-General are responsible to the Postmaster-General for the translation of Post Office matters, and they are responsible to the Minister of Finance for the translation of Tariff Board matters.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well if that is so it should be corrected.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well now, Mr. Bland, this is elementary, that something should be done. If a translator who was not replaced in the Department of Finance should have

to be replaced by some translator there, do you not think it would be better to have it done?—A. I think the proper way to handle a situation like that, Mr. Pouliot, would be to have a man in the position of superintendent in control to whom the Chairman of the Tariff Board could apply for help when he needed it.

Q. Well now, if the superintendent arranged that matter to the satisfaction of the Tariff Board and the Department of Finance by having a translator there, if that were done he would have something else to do as a matter of co-ordination in the Department of Finance.—A. I think it would be a pretty continuing problem. There are always necessities arising and there are always requests coming in for this peak load or that peak load, and he would have a pretty steady job, I imagine, for a time seeing that the processes of production were properly carried out.

Q. And, therefore, it would be necessary to have a supplemental branch such as the blue book branch to take care of the overflow of translation?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Or some other official.

The WITNESS: You have got to have some relief employees.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. For the overflow?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We have been talking about co-operation and collaboration all morning. That means, I suppose collaboration and co-ordination by mutuality. Did it ever strike you, Mr. Chairman, how peculiar section 3 of the Bill reads:—

That there shall be a bureau under the minister, to be called the bureau for translations, the duties and functions of which shall be to collaborate with and act for all departments of the public service, and both Houses of the Parliament of Canada and all bureaus, branches, commissions and agencies created or appointed by Act of Parliament, or by **order of the Governor in Council**, in making and revising all translations from one language into another of all departmental and other reports, documents, debates, bills, acts, proceedings and correspondence.

But there is nothing said about the collaboration of the public service with this bureau.

The WITNESS: What about the next paragraph, Mr. Chevrier?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. There is nothing in there. However, I just put that out as a matter of thought?—A. What about section 3, subsection (2).

Mr. MACINNIS: Subsection 2 of section 3, Mr. Chevrier.

The WITNESS: Does not that cover the other?

Mr. ERNST: It reads:—

It shall be the duty of all departments of the public service and all such branches, commissions and agencies as aforesaid to collaborate with the bureau in carrying into effect the provisions of this Act and the regulations made thereunder.

Mr. CHEVRIER: My idea is, that that ought to be in the one section. However, it does not make any difference.

The WITNESS: Obviously, if there is to be collaboration there must be collaboration on the part of both sides.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But you admit that the translation business is a most difficult matter.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Bland, you stated that you would endeavour to show me what your interpretation of the working out of this Bill is, and I would like to get that. Would you like to do that now?—A. Well, I will be glad to do it if the committee want me to do so. However, I had hoped this morning that I had given a kind of picture of how the Bill would work.

Q. Oh, no, I have not got that yet. I thought that there had been a survey, that you had made a survey of this matter before and had prepared this Bill; or had you had anything to do with the preparation of it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or discussed it with anyone, or had any correspondence?—A. I have had some discussions with the Secretary of State. I furnished him with a good deal of information on the same lines as the information furnished to the committee.

Q. Well, is that information available, Mr. Bland?—A. I think it is all tabled, Mr. Chevrier, with the committee, simply the number of translators, where they were located, the law on the matter, the cost of the translation service, and so on.

Q. How is it intended that this thing should work out?

Mr. ERNST: Has not he been telling you all morning?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No, no. We have been on a number of details, and there is nothing here in this Bill that shows how this thing is going to be done.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Have you in mind asking Mr. Bland to take each department and show what is going to be done in that department?

Mr. CHEVRIER: For instance what will be done here in the House of Commons under this Bill.

The WITNESS: The first step under the Bill seems to provide that there shall be a co-ordinated translator service for all departments. The second step is to appoint a superintendent of translation, and I should imagine that the steps following that would devolve largely upon the superintendent of translation. I am only giving you what I think should be done.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Supposing that the Bill passed as it is then there would be a superintendent, what would happen to the various staffs here, would they be disturbed and taken away from where they are?—A. That is a matter that would not be decided until the superintendent had made his report.

Q. Oh, yes, but that is what I wanted to find out first before I allow this Bill to go through. That is of primary importance.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Surely you would not ask Mr. Bland to tell this committee what he would do if John Jones or somebody else was a translator in a department, what would be done if this Bill went into effect; he surely cannot tell us that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then, Mr. Chairman, I put it quite plainly, that there is nobody who can tell me what will happen these various staffs, and if that is the case then I am against this Bill right now and you will have a minority report.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: You have been against it all the time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have been against the principle of it because nobody has shown me that I am wrong in my interpretation of the principle.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What you are now asking Mr. Bland to do is to go into actual details of administration under a Bill which has, in the first place, not yet been passed, and where no superintendent, no staff has been set up, and where no survey has been made. Surely that has to be made by the incoming superintendent or official of the department.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, when you build a house, or construction of any kind, you have a purpose in mind. You may build a tremendously large box but you have some idea of what you are going to put into that box and of how you are going to divide it, and so on; you have got an idea as to the divisions that are going to be placed in your building. There may be certain minor changes as to the location of the furniture, but you know that when you build the building you build it for a certain purpose. That is what I want to find out about this Bill, what is the purpose of the Bill?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I cannot see that. Mr. Bland has been spending an hour and a half telling us what the general principles of the Bill are, and in so far as the Bill itself is concerned the government have taken the responsibility for it. They will set up their staff and I presume will decide in due course as to how or what is best to bring into effect the various recommendations which Mr. Bland, I think, has generally and fairly outlined this morning.

Mr. ERNST: You are not asking for legislation, you are asking for details of regulation.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I want to find out now, for instance, as to the staff of the House of Commons, if this Bill passes does it mean that they pass from under the control of the House of Commons?

Mr. ERNST: Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, I am against that.

Mr. ERNST: I think there is no question about it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And I do not know what is going to happen to the Interior. If it means that the 100 translators are going to be disturbed then I am against the Bill on that score also. I understand that there are certain features about a Bill of this kind that would be highly acceptable on the mechanical side, and improving the manner of production as well. I agree that there are certain things that might be improved, but unless I know just how that is going to be done I am not going to buy a pig in a poke.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to help as much as I can in clearing up that point. I am quite sure I can clear it up, and I wonder if it would not help perhaps, particularly as departmental staffs are concerned, if I were to recall the picture of what did take place when a similar Bill was put through with reference to the accounting services.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is not the same thing.

The WITNESS: I know that the accounting service is not the same thing.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not the same thing at all.

The WITNESS: I agree it is not the same thing, but I would like to give you a picture of what took place in connection with that Bill.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will always gladly hear you Mr. Bland, but you cannot convince me. The procedure may be all right, the procedure in this Bill may be exactly of the order in the accounting Bill.

The WITNESS: Well, I can see in your mind, Mr. Chevrier, some doubt and apprehension as to what might take place regarding personnel particularly, and I would like to tell you what took place in connection with the amalgamation of accountants because I think the same apprehensions existed at that time or prior to the passage of that Bill as exists at the present time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If I had someone in authority who could tell me that, if you come back sometime later and tell me you are clothed with proper authority then all right, but until I hear from someone who has that authority then I am quite opposed to this Bill.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. Tell me what did happen with the other Bill, Mr. Bland?—A. What happened was this: The Bill was introduced, to consolidate or amalgamate or co-ordinate, whatever you like to call it, the accounting services, and I think it is not an exaggeration to say that when the Bill was introduced there was considerable apprehension in the accounting staffs. Just as Mr. Chevrier says, nobody knew what was going to happen so there was apprehension at that time. The Bill was passed, however, and what took place was this: I do not think any detailed plans were drawn up beforehand. I do not think that could have been done without due survey as to exactly what was going to happen, but as soon as the Bill was passed a survey was made—and I think it could have been called a comprehensive co-operative survey. That survey was conducted between the then appointed controller of the treasury and the deputy ministers of the departments concerned and the accounting officers of the offices concerned, and the Civil Service Commission had some little hand in it. As a result of the several conversations that were had gradually the proper thing to be done evolved, and primarily from one side or primarily from the other side as the result of talking the thing over, as the result of a good many conversations, I think generally speaking it is safe to say that a conclusion was arrived at that was satisfactory not only to the controller of the treasury but to the departmental heads and the officials of the accounting services concerned. It seems to me it is only logical to conceive that a similar happening would take place in connection with this Bill.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That would be perfectly all right if translation were not what it is. In an accounting system there may be various methods but you all reach the same purpose, and it is purely and simply a matter of taking the system and using numbers. The chief accountant may reside in the City of Toronto and daily a report might be made to him in which case he would simply have to check over the figures; but there are no experts in accountancy in the same sense that there are experts in translation.—A. I do not know that the accountants would care to accept that statement.

Q. I know that there are expert accountants.—A. But granting the difference, Mr. Chevrier, what I was trying to bring out was this: It seems to me it would be logical to expect that there would be a reasonable survey between the superintendent, the chief translators as well as the deputy ministers before an actual plan of operation was finally decided on.

Q. There are two features about this, two main features. I do not see how it can work by having the House of Commons and the Senate staffs taken away, if that is the effect of it, of taking away the Senate staff and the House of Commons staff from the authority of parliament and putting them under a minister, doing away with our control over them, putting them under the jurisdiction of the superintendent. If that is to be the case then I am against it. Secondly, if this Bill would have the effect of taking away from the departments the technicians, the technical translators and putting them into a hotch potch, or making them subject to a sort of flying regulation which would take a man from one department to do work in another department, say from the Finance Department to the Post Office Department, then I am against it. That is my conception of the Bill, and if someone will clear it up then it may be that I will change my mind.

Mr. MACINNIS: Does it seem at all conceivable to you that the Minister would introduce a Bill to disrupt the work that he is supposed to carry out?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not intentionally but it may have that effect.

Mr. MACINNES: It may, and again it may not.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier said something about taking away from parliament the authority of parliament. It still remains under the authority of parliament whether we pass this Bill or not.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not a bit of it, Mr. Chairman. I am absolutely opposed to that view. Have you ever considered this feature. I speak in English, or I endeavour to speak in English. If I speak in the House in English it will be translated into French. I speak French and then that will have to be translated into English. Then you immediately get a dual responsibility in that hotch-potch; you divide the responsibility between the House and the superintendent.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I cannot see any dividing about it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Who is responsible? Supposing a translation is done to-day as it is done now and you complain that your English speech has not been properly translated into French, if it is possible that the translators did not know their business and you objected to that translation, as it is now you have an immediate right of recourse because these translators are under the authority of parliament, they are under the authority of the Debates Committee; but if these translators are removed and they come under the Secretary of State, or any other minister, and under a superintendent and you take objection to the translation, well then you have no control over them.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have to go through the minister while at the present time they are immediately under the control of the House, the Debates Committee; they are not even under the control of the government.

Mr. ERNST: Your procedure is to appeal to the House and if the House is willing the correction is made. If you appeal to the Minister and the House is willing the minister has to make the correction.

Mr. CHEVRIER: However, that is my stand.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. To whom would the translator be responsible, to the superintendent or to the deputy minister?—A. Both, I should say.

Q. If one is satisfied and the other is not, what would happen?—A. If you have a good superintendent they both would be satisfied. If you have a bad superintendent the thing would not work.

Q. It is just like a dog with two heads.—A. Well, Mr. Chairman, right there again, with due deference to the difference that there is in this case, the same situation exists in the accounting services. In the accounting branch the accounting officer must give satisfaction to the controller of the treasury and also to the deputy minister of the department whom he serves.

Q. But you will admit this, Mr. Bland, that accounting can be uniform, that it can be a uniform system of accounting in all branches of all departments because the figures are the same, they do not belong to any language, but with regard to the translation of languages it is entirely different.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: French is French and English is English.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, but the figure one in English is the same as it is in French.

The WITNESS: I was referring, Mr. Pouliot, not to the differences that do exist between translations and accounting but to the question of responsibility about which you ask me.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I asked you a question about responsibility, and after that I asked you a question about uniformity with regard to co-ordination.—A. Well, I think there should be; there is a different type of uniformity.

Q. And you will admit also, Mr. Bland, that it is impossible to take an accounting system and use it as it is for accounting purposes and also use it for the translation business?—A. Oh quite, I was not suggesting that at all.

Q. You know that would be absurd. Therefore, a distinction has to be made between translation and accounting, and an expert in accounting is an expert in all branches of accounting.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, not necessarily.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, take it another way: An expert in accounting is more familiar with all branches of accounting than an expert is with all forms of translation.

Mr. ERNST: Why?

Mr. POULIOT: It is very easy to tell why.

Mr. CHEVRIER: For instance, an expert in Hebrew and an expert in Gaelic.

Mr. POULIOT: Exactly. A man who is well posted in accounting is in a better position to explain anything relating to accounting business than a man who knows Hebrew and English is able to tell about French translation, even if he knows Hebrew and English very well.

Mr. ERNST: You do not suppose a man who knows only Hebrew and English is going to be made general superintendent, do you?

Mr. POULIOT: The general superintendent is going to be a wonder if he is going to take over all these units.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do you want to ask Mr. Bland any further questions, Mr. Pouliot?

Mr. POULIOT: I have some further questions to ask Mr. Bland, but it is five minutes to one and I think it would be just as well to leave it until four o'clock. I believe that Mr. Bland's evidence will take the whole of the afternoon and it would be just as well to notify the other gentlemen who have been asked to appear not to come this afternoon.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier, I just want to clear up one point. You asked Mr. Bland to give you some sort of an outline how the Act would work out. Would you just explain to us a little more clearly what you want, what Mr. Bland is to supply.

Mr. CHEVRIER: After what has been said I do not suppose that I need ask him anything further about it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Then we will adjourn to meet again at four o'clock this afternoon.

The committee adjourned at 1 p.m. to resume at 4 p.m.

The committee resumed at 4 o'clock.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Before we proceed with anything, Mr. Chairman, might I be allowed to ask that a correction be made on page 62 of the evidence?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Would you mind waiting until I have a look at it, Mr. Chevrier? Now, what is it?

Mr. CHEVRIER: After the question by Mr. MacInnis there, there is a question by myself: "Do you mean to say that you translate 5,000 pages of chemical reports in the year?" I may have said that, but what I had in mind, and the context will show it, was "technical."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Instead of "chemical"?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, that word. I may have said "chemical," but the context will show it was "technical" that I meant.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

CHARLES H. BLAND, recalled.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Might I ask you, Mr. Bland, about that 1924 report; did you produce it or will you produce it later?—A. I have copies here, Mr. Chevrier, just now.

Q. There is just one question about it for the present: do you remember whether, in that report, the House of Commons and the Senate were included?—A. Whether they were covered?

Q. Yes?—A. It is my recollection that they were not.

MR. CHEVRIER: Now, Mr. Chairman, with the agreement of the committee, following up what I said this morning—and it would help me considerably in the attitude I have to take on this Bill—there were a number of references made by the Hon. the Secretary of State when he introduced the Bill, and particularly on second reading, some of which I want to mention. I just want to put them down now, and if they can be indicated to anybody in authority, so that the next time if there is any explanation to be given, it would help me in coming to a conclusion. There are only two things I would like to point out. At page 1067 of Hansard, on February 27, right at the bottom of the left-hand column, it reads thus:—

It is contemplated that the Bureau for Translations which will be created by this Bill, may be divided into two branches. One of the two branches would be known as the Parliamentary Translators Branch, whose first duty would be to translate the debates and proceedings of the Senate and of the House of Commons, and the second, that is, the Departmental Translators Branch, whose first duty would be to translate departmental reports, documents and despatches as required.

If I had any assurance as to what will happen, provided it remains under the House of Commons, that would simplify my work.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: You say, “provided it remains under the House of Commons”?

MR. CHEVRIER: Yes.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, that is hardly possible under the bill, is it?

MR. CHEVRIER: Unless it be amended. I mean this, what I am endeavouring to do is just to—

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Shorten it up?

MR. CHEVRIER: Yes, and I don't know how far this can go, and I just want to put it on record, and if this can go in some way to someone in authority, and if I got some kind of assurance, it will help me.

MR. ERNST: You would move an amendment, in that case.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Chevrier is perhaps throwing out a suggestion that if he could be met to a certain extent, he would take it into consideration.

MR. CHEVRIER: Yes. Then on page 1069—

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Just before you go on with that next point, Mr. Chevrier, your suggestion is, of course, that the Parliamentary Translators Branch as it is referred to in Hansard, be really left as it is at the present time, or that the present translators staff of the House of Commons and of the Senate be left as it is, under the authority of the Speaker of the House, as in the House of Commons?

MR. CHEVRIER: In two words, what I would like to see done would be to leave the translation branches of the House of Commons and the Senate just where they are to-day.

MR. ERNST: Under the control of the house.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Under the control of the debates committee, controlled by the house, just as they are now.

Mr. ERNST: In other words, have them exempted from the bill? I just want to get it clear. In other words, you would like to see an amendment to the bill which would exempt them from its provisions?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, to exempt them from the operation of the bill.

Mr. ERNST: Correct.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier, would you consider this in the meantime. The statement made by the Secretary of State, to which you have just referred in Hansard, distinctly states that there will be a separate branch. They do not go far enough for you?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: All right.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Apparently those two branches would be outside the control of the house. Then in view of certain statements that the Secretary of State had made, and I take them in the same way as he has made this statement, in absolute good faith,—and I have the greatest kindly feeling for him,—I would like to get something more concrete. At page 1069 of Hansard there is this statement:—

“ . . . we are asking that the facts be elicited before a special committee and duly considered, and that those who are employed in the translation of the debates of the Senate and the House of Commons should be organized into this Parliamentary Translators Branch of a general bureau for translations under a minister of the crown . . . ”

I just do not get what that means.

Mr. ERNST: Does it not appear to you if it goes through as it is, they will come under the Secretary of State?

Mr. CHEVRIER: If that interpretation is placed upon it, I cannot agree.

Mr. ERNST: I say that is my interpretation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think that is correct.

Mr. ERNST: I don't see any other possible one.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then the last one—because I do not want to labour it unduly—will be found at page 1393, again the Secretary of State, at the bottom of the left hand column:

It is the intention of the Government that any translators who have specialized in particular subjects shall continue their work in respect of the same subjects, and where possible their services will be utilized to supervise the work of the less competent translators.

If I had some assurance that these specialists will not be disturbed, and that the House of Commons and the Senate would be left where they are under their present control, it would not take me very long to come to a conclusion on this Bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: To what extent do you mean by the word “disturb”? That is a rather general term.

Mr. CHEVRIER: As I said this morning, there are certain improvements that might be made in the way of producing these translations—not in the finished product, I do not think. But what I am perturbed about is that there is no guarantee that these special translators would not be ousted from where they are, and put into some common melting pot where everybody will lose his own identity and his own efficiency. That is it in brief, and I just wanted to put it on record, so if there are any possible suggestions to come later, I would be glad.

Mr. ERNST: Your last remark had reference to the personnel, as to what might happen to the personnel itself?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: Rather than the principle of the Bill?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, to the personnel.

Mr. ERNST: I don't quite see how that assurance could be given.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In any event, Mr. Chevrier's suggestions are on record.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Bland, this morning you made a distinction between legislative and administrative services. I will submit to you my understanding of the whole system, and I will ask you afterwards to please tell me if you agree with me. First of all, it is commonly conceded that parliament is supreme; and parliament consists of the Crown or its representative, the House of Commons and the Senate. This is a perfect body, and the government is only a permanent committee of parliament. Do you agree with that?—A. Would you give me the whole proposition first, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. Yes. The government is composed of ministers, and each of the cabinet ministers ranks as the head of a sub-committee of that permanent committee of parliament. Therefore distinction should be made, as you made this morning, between legislative or parliamentary business and administrative or governmental business. Do you agree with this?—A. I think there is a distinction, yes.

Q. Do you admit also, Mr. Bland, that authority is necessary to have good work done?—A. Yes.

Q. You admit also, probably, that the heads of those sub-committees or the ministers of the Crown are responsible to parliament, and that the civil servants who work under those ministers are indirectly responsible to parliament through the ministers who are personally responsible to parliament. Therefore authority lies first with the parliament, and then it is delegated to that committee which is called the government; and then delegated again, to a certain extent, by Order in Council or otherwise, or according to statute, to the ministers who are heads of those sub-committees; and within such sub-committees the minister has full jurisdiction in accordance with and by virtue of the powers which have been delegated to him. That is a fair understanding of the whole system. Therefore, Mr. Bland, you admit that an important distinction should be made between legislative units and administrative units, do you?—A. I think there is a distinction, yes.

Q. Now, what is the role of the Civil Service Commission in the matter; when the minister who is head of one of the sub-committees desires some help, he requires it from the Civil Service Commission, in order that the applicant should pass an examination and should qualify himself to the vacant position; that is the business of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ERNST: Part of it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well, I mean, that is it?—A. Part of it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But the main business—you have other things—the main business of the Civil Service Commission is to see that persons before they are employed should be well qualified to do the job before they are appointed by the Civil Service Commission?—A. Yes, I think that is an important part.

Q. And in that connection the Civil Service Commission is the agency to recruit suitable people to fill vacancies in the various departments. After these

people have been appointed to these positions, are they still under the jurisdiction of the commission, excepting naturally the personnel of the commission; are under the jurisdiction of each deputy head and minister?—A. Well, I think there is a dual answer to that question, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Please give it?—A. Primarily they are under jurisdiction of the deputy minister, but the commission, as I understand it, has a larger function to perform than simply the selection of candidates in the first place.

Q. Please elaborate that briefly?—A. It is the commission's duty to act as a personnel agency for the government; and a personnel agency's duties comprise a good deal more than the mere selection of employees; I think they also comprise helping officials in management of the personnel in all branches of the service. In other words, the watchword of the commission is primarily service, not only in the selection of employees, but in the treatment and handling of employees subsequently.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. That is true in all substantial organizations?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But suppose "A" applies for a job, "A" is successful at the examination, the commission gives a certificate recommending the appointment. "A" is appointed. You know nothing of "A" except through the Deputy Minister, or through someone under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Minister, who communicates with the Civil Service Commission about "A"; and you have an unfavourable report about "A," a notice to the effect that the deputy head, or the minister, or the chief of the branch is not satisfied with the way work is done by "A"; and those who have authority upon "A" are at the same time the channel of communication between "A" and yourself. Therefore, the authority lies only on the deputy head with regard to "A"—or the minister—and if they are satisfied with "A" you cannot do anything about that employment?—A. Well, I can see the logic of a good deal of that argument, Mr. Pouliot; but I think there is a further side to it. I think it is quite true that the relationships and communications regarding "A" come to the commission through the deputy minister of the department; but in the exercise of the commission's duties and functions, it must follow up its work properly and learn a good deal about the functioning of the department; and assuming that it is doing what it should be doing it learns a good deal about the service and the way the different units are functioning, whether they are functioning well or not. I think it is the duty of the commission to get in touch with the deputy minister of the department and endeavour to be of service to him in improving these functions.

Q. Does the commission do that on its own at times, or is it done only at the request of the department?—A. It is just done when the commission thinks it can be of service.

Q. Yes, and naturally it is a very delicate matter, because it might lead to conflict between the commission and deputy heads of departments?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, it is a very delicate matter?—A. It has to be handled with tact, sometimes, yes.

Q. And the commission has no authority to enforce any suggestion which is made, the enforcement must be made either by the minister, or by the government, or by statute?—A. Well, of course, the Civil Service Act does convey a certain authority on the commission with reference to certain features of employment other than the mere selection of employees. In the first instance it confers certain authority on the commission in regard to rates of remuneration, classification of positions, leave of absence, attendance regulations, and the like. There are certain exceptions where the commission is, under the law, empowered to work with the deputy.

Q. But, for instance, take times when the government decide to suspend for a time the payment of full remuneration; the Civil Service Commission has to stand by the order of the government?—A. Well, all questions of money are the function of the government.

Q. I was not discussing the merit or demerit of the matter, but mention this only as an illustration?—A. That is because of the fact that the payment of funds rests in the government's hands.

Q. That is not my argument, the Civil Service Commission stopped that because it was ordered to do so by the government; I do not discuss the motives, do you see?—A. I agree with that, except that the reason for it was—

Q. There might be a good reason, I do not discuss that, whether the reason is good or bad; but my only argument is the relation of the Civil Service Commission with the government, the Civil Service Commission is under the jurisdiction of the government in accordance with the statute, and in accordance with certain orders in council which might be passed in accordance with the powers vested in the government by law or statute?—A. I would not like to go just that far, Mr. Pouliot; I do not think I can quite agree with that statement.

Q. You will admit first that the Civil Service Commission is governed by the Civil Service Act?—A. Yes.

Q. And under the law of the country there are certain powers which are vested in the government with regard to employment of the personnel of the civil service?—A. Well, the powers of employment as regards personnel are included in the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Q. Yes, but there are orders in council that are passed nevertheless, and when that order in council is passed by the government the Civil Service Commission has to act upon it?—A. If it is in accordance with the Act, but we must not confuse these two things. There are certain units of the government that are not subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act. In these cases there are different provisions for employment, which may be made either by Order in Council, or by estimates, whatever the case may be.

Q. But when a vote is passed by the House appointing any one, the Civil Service Commission has nothing to say in the matter?—A. Quite so.

Q. Because parliament is supreme. You said a moment ago that the Civil Service Commission acts as an agent for the government for recruiting the service, and afterwards the commission looks after the welfare and salaries of employees to a certain extent in accordance with the provisions of the law. Well, if the government decides to ask the Civil Service Commission to make a survey about the translation business in the various departments, and also in the House of Commons, and in the Senate, I wonder if the Civil Service Commission is able to do that work for the government—I will ask the witness if the Civil Service Commission can do that?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: You think they are incapable of doing it?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I mean, have they enough information available to do that in a manner satisfactory to the government?—A. In any service of that kind, Mr. Pouliot, I think our common sources of information are likely to be augmented. We have been asked on many occasions to make a survey into this, or other things. We go as far as we can go ourselves, and then we would have to augment our own resources by others.

Q. Yes, and just a word about that, Mr. Chairman; as I said, I do not say that at all in a critical way, I ask that just seeking information—the government might want information about each individual, and about his work; would it be possible for the Civil Service Commission to do that?—A. Well, it is a pretty big order to get full information about each individual, I think we can make a very comprehensive survey.

Q. And, you can make your suggestions, but these suggestions could not be enforced unless they are approved by the government; and in fact they would be enforced by the government itself?—A. Yes, they could not be enforced until they had been given effect to by Order in Council.

Q. And the Civil Service Commission could not enforce that because the Commission has no jurisdiction over the Deputy Minister of each department, is that the case?—A. Yes, that is largely true. I will put it rather this way, that it is extremely difficult to carry out a scheme that involves the commission and the departments without ample authority; you can make some headway, but you can't make as much.

Q. Oh yes, but there is a great difference between asking for information, and putting conclusions into effect, or giving effect to suggestions?—A. Quite true.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That would apply, of course, to all departments.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Oh yes, but I take it from this point of view, that the Civil Service Commission in that case might offer suggestions and it would be pretty difficult to have those suggestions enforced by any one other than the government?—A. I think it needs authority to enforce them.

Q. For that very reason, therefore, if we had on the one hand a general superintendent of translation and on the other hand the deputy head of the department, two things might happen; either they agree, or they disagree, if they disagree who will decide which one is right; will it be the minister of the department, or the minister under whom the general superintendent would be?—A. Under the provisions of the bill the matter of translation, as I understand it, would be under the control of the superintendent of the Bureau of Translation, he in turn would be subject to the direction of his minister. As I stated this morning this system is working satisfactorily and successfully I think with respect to the accounting services.

Q. Yes, therefore if they do not agree we will have that conflict of authority between them, and not only between the superintendent of translation and the deputy head of the department but also between the two ministers, if each supports his own man?—A. It is conceivable, I think, Mr. Pouliot; the same situation exists in the accounting staff—the same possibility might exist there.

Q. Yes, and as there are 45 units they have 45 opportunities for conflict between the superintendent of translation and the deputy heads of the departments in which these units are located; or the chiefs of the branches. And now suppose, for instance, that the translator is here in the House of Commons—at present he is under the jurisdiction of the Clerk of the House, and indirectly under the jurisdiction of Mr. Speaker—the bill passes, he will come under the jurisdiction of the General Superintendent of Translations. The Clerk of the House rings the bell to get him; the Superintendent of Translations rings the bell at the same time to get him; whom is he to obey, it is pretty hard to tell?—A. It would be still worse, Mr. Pouliot if all the 45 units called him up at the same time.

Q. Yes, exactly; because the superintendent, even if he is a genius, could not be gifted with ubiquity.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you have any conflict in these 45 units of the accounting service?—A. I do not say there are not difficulties, but I think with the exercise of common sense such as is exercised there, the difficulties work out very satisfactorily.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Yes, but that is only an assumption, or an hypothesis?—A. That there will be common sense?

Q. No, that they will always agree. There will be conflicts, and it will cause trouble to the government; and each time there is conflict, each of these high-grade officials will go to his minister and then the trouble might continue?—A. I do not think it is altogether bad to have differences of opinion, you know. I think differences of opinion will exist, but as I said this morning, if you get a proper man as superintendent I do not think differences of opinion will prevent his giving satisfactory service.

Q. On the other hand we were supposing that there might be conflict. This was a pessimistic view; now we will take the optimistic view and suppose that they will always agree; and now you see my conclusion. If they always agree, what is the use of a superintendent?—A. A very embarrassing dilemma.

Q. It is a very embarrassing dilemma. My mind was very much confused when I thought about it, because I could not see any solution to it, and I am very frank about it. I cannot see gentlemen who have intelligence agreeing about everything all the time with forty-five other intelligent people; it is quite out of the ordinary unless he is a man. But now, sir, has the Civil Service Commission had something to do with that bill? Will you please tell us if the Civil Service Commission was the promoter of the bill, or if the first idea of this scheme originated with the Civil Service Commission.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. Pouliot, you remember that Mr. Bland said this morning they did not have anything to do with the drafting of it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Maybe not with the drafting of it; I think Mr. Pouliot's question was about where the scheme originated.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think that question is out of order, the people introducing the bill must assume responsibility for it regardless of where the suggestion came from. I do not think we should insist upon the witness answering questions of that kind. As a matter of fact, I have very strong objections to any man answering that question as I do not think it is a fair question.

Mr. POULIOT: If you will permit me, Mr. MacInnis, I will explain why I asked it.

Mr. MACINNIS: It does not make any difference.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It is, because if as indicated to me the Civil Service Commission was the father of the thought, it would be better explained by the Civil Service Commission than by anyone else, because, as it is now, I am a newcomer to this committee; this is the first year I have sat here and I am greatly honoured, and I have no instructions from my leader to block the bill or anything; what I want, is the relative advantage there is in it, and the supposed improvement that will ensue from it. I want some information. I am not strong on paying compliments, but I would tell Mr. Bland, after having heard him very often in the committee, that I do not wish to flatter any one, but he seems to be one of the twenty—or the twelve—best informed in civil service.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

Mr. POULIOT: He must be in earnest, he is experienced, and he has to look after the welfare of the civil servants; therefore, I ask him for information. I would not ask it from the honourable minister the other day because he objected, he made a statement and said I will not answer any questions. We must have information from some one, and I would be glad to have it from Mr. Bland.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not say that in a complimentary way; I say it because I believe it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Just what is your question, Mr. Pouliot?

Mr. POULIOT: My question, sir, is: Was the Civil Service Commission the promoter of this scheme?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether the question is quite proper, Mr. Pouliot. If Mr. Bland wants to answer it he can answer it. I do not see any objection to it.

The WITNESS: Well, I obviously cannot answer the question in full because I can only tell you what I know myself.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I am satisfied with that.—A. As I said this morning, away back in 1924 this translation service was one of the subjects dealt with in a report to a special committee of the Senate. It was subsequently referred to on several occasions in the annual report of the commission and has been one of the subjects that has been under consideration for some years.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Was it the intention then to have centralization?—A. I think perhaps the thing first originated with the report of 1924.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Since then, Mr. Bland, have you taken any steps, or have you done anything else since 1924 for the purpose of establishing this bureau of translation?—A. I have provided the Secretary of State on several occasions with information that he requested in connection with the translation service.

Q. And is there any objection to the committee having that information?—A. It already has it, I think, Mr. Chevrier. I do not think that there is anything that I gave Mr. Cahan that has not been tabled before the committee, except possibly the law itself which you already have.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I think that what you said was that you had been called in by the Secretary of State and he consulted with you with regard to some of these matters?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. So there were two occasions, in 1924 and at some recent date?—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Would not the bureau of translation, Mr. Bland, fall within the recommendations made by the committee of 1932? In number 12 of our report:—

To promote economy and efficiency in engineering and mapping services, or in other services which can be centralized, your committee recommends to the Civil Service Commission that a careful study be made of such government services with a view to amalgamations thereof.

A. As pointed out in our annual report, suggestions have been made and work has been done on a number of such amalgamations such as the legal service, accounting service, and so on, and it might logically follow that this is one of the subjects that has been under consideration by the commission.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. This was recommended away back in 1924.—A. I can only tell you when we came into it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Did you at the request of the Secretary of State discuss the draft of the Bill with anyone else?—A. I do not think that I have discussed the draft of the Bill with anyone.

Q. Was it suggested to you by the Honourable the Secretary of State that you discuss that Bill with anyone?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I question, Mr. Pouliot, whether you should go into conversations that took place.

Mr. POULIOT: I will leave the Honourable the Secretary of State aside.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well, was it suggested to you by anyone?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The same objection, Mr. Pouliot, would apply.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well, I will put the plain question: Did you try to discuss it with other officials other than your colleagues on the Civil Service Commission?—A. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, there is anything to be hidden in this business as far as I am concerned. I have nothing to hide. I think what Mr. Pouliot is trying to get at is the statement made by the Secretary of State in the return that there were discussions between Dr. Beausnesne and Mr. Bland. You want to know did I discuss it with Dr. Beausnesne?

Q. Yes?—A. No, I did not.

Q. Did Dr. Beausnesne write to you?—A. Yes. I had some discussion but not as to the effect of the Bill. I attempted to discuss the matter with Dr. Beausnesne but found that at the time I was in town he was out of town, and when I had occasion to leave the city on business he was in town, so we did not make connections.

Q. You did not discuss it with him?—A. No, I did not.

Q. You discussed it only with the Honourable the Secretary of State?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Bauchesne was not in town when you tried to reach him, was he?—A. I was absent from town for a period of a month, I think, and, as far as I know, Mr. Bauchesne was in town during that period. When I returned I found that Mr. Bauchesne had left town. Both of us did not happen to be here at the same time.

Q. On July 17 of last year did Mr. Bauchesne write to you from Kamouraska?—A. He wrote me from Kamouraska; I think that was about the date.

Q. And did he tell you at that time that he was preparing a memorandum for council which was the first draft of this Bill?

Mr. ERNST: We should have the letter.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You have that letter, Mr. Bland?—A. I do not know that I would care to table that letter, not that there is anything in it that should not be tabled.

Q. It is because Mr. Ernst asked for the production of it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What Mr. Ernst meant was that he should not be examined on a letter which is not produced.

Mr. POULIOT: I will not insist on it, but Mr. Ernst was the one who wanted it produced.

Mr. ERNST: No, no, I do not want it produced. I would just as soon move we adjourn if this is all we are going to do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Oh no, Mr. Pouliot is quite within his rights.

Mr. POULIOT: I am just asking that question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Pouliot is quite right.

The WITNESS: My feeling is this, Mr. Chairman, I am only too glad to tell the committee anything I have done in connection with this matter, but I do not think it is quite fair to ask me about something that somebody else was doing.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Apparently from what has been put in evidence now, Mr. Beauchesne did write to Mr. Bland and send him a memo of some kind with reference to this matter.

The WITNESS: I wrote to him and told him I would be glad to discuss the matter with him and he replied and told me he was in Kamouraska and said he thought he would be back at a certain date.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Then according to the evidence, Mr. Beauchesne—I may be wrong in this impression—did send in a memorandum with reference to this matter, either in the way of suggestion or something else.—A. I do not know whether he did or not.

Q. Not to you?—A. No. Subsequently to that I had neither conversation, or discussion, or correspondence with Mr. Beauchesne.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, Mr. Bland, will you please tell us what suggestions were made by the Civil Service Commission to the Secretary of State by memorandum, or if you have that information available—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether any suggestion was made. Just how far are we going to enquire as to that?

Mr. ERNST: Mr. Bland has stated that he has given the committee everything that he gave to the Secretary of State. What more can we get? There must be an end to it sometime, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right, but—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Go on with your question, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you. Will I explain to you?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No no. We are giving you the very widest possible latitude.

Mr. POULIOT: I appreciate that very highly, and I tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that it will be much shorter that way. We have several witnesses to hear but they will be very short. We will tell them what we want to hear from them, but now we have Mr. Bland here and I would like to ask him what suggestions have been made by himself to the government when the draft of the Bill was submitted to him for his examination.

The WITNESS: I would like to cover that as fully as I can. Back in 1924 the commission did submit a report on the general subject. It was repeated on several occasions in the annual report of the commission. When Mr. Cahan asked me for information regarding the translation service, to the best of my recollection I gave him the same information that I have given the committee, namely, the names and number, and costs and distribution of translators in the service, together with the clauses of the law relating to the transfer of employees, to the kind of service of the employees of the House of Commons and the Senate, and I do not think anything further was handed in to the Secretary of State than the documents covering these matters.

Q. Did the commission suggest to the government that the superintendent of the bureau should be appointed under the Civil Service Commission?—A. Yes subsequently.

Q. Yes, and why was that recommended?—A. Because I think it is good business to do so.

Q. And was it also done because it provided for a line of promotion for other officials?—A. Yes.

Q. And because the superintendent would not be the head of a very large branch?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Civil Service Commission saw no reason for his exclusion?—A. We thought it was good business that he should be included.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is, under the jurisdiction of the commission?—A. Yes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: You will make a good Bill out of this if you keep on, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You see, it is not so bad to allow me to ask those questions.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I might add that it is wide open for improvement.

Mr. POULIOT: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have one thing to ask. Mr. Coleman and Mr. Paradis were called on for statements. Mr. Paradis is head of the law translation branch of the House of Commons, and he will come at the next sitting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: And besides that I have asked Mr. Fraser to notify Mr. Coleman, the Under Secretary of State and Mr. Edwards of the Department of Justice, the deputy minister.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory to all?

Mr. POULIOT: Before you say that, I would like to point out to you what I have been asking from them. To each one I wrote the same letter. What I would like to know is how the translation is being made in each branch of your department, and what translation is made, if any, outside each branch and by whom? Is that proper?

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I think that is very pertinent.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, because I would like to have some information about the work that is done outside of each department, and it seems to be useless almost, to ask these gentlemen who are very busy to come here if I cannot ask those questions.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is any objection to asking that at all, unless any member of the committee sees any. I think they could be very well called. The only thing I was going to say is when you call a deputy, he should hardly be asked to give his opinion upon a matter of policy which would arise out of the bringing into force of this bill.

Mr. POULIOT: No. 'It is just to know how matters stand in each department, how the translation is made, the average number of letters they receive each year, the number of letters they have to translate, how it is done and how fast, and so on. Besides these two gentlemen, if the committee is agreeable to it, I would like to have others, other heads of departments, and it would be very short for each one. Each one could prepare a memorandum of five or ten minutes, and then you would have a survey of the whole thing from the inside point of view. Mr. Bland gave us the outside point of view.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Would it not be possible when Mr. Bland brings in the information that I asked for this morning—I asked for that information this morning covering each department—that that be set forth, the amount of translation, the number of translators, the salaries received and so forth. Surely it is not necessary to go into the details with each department?

Mr. POULIOT: Well, I would like to know if there is some outside translation done in each department and who does it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bland might incorporate that in what I asked for.

The WITNESS: I was going to ask Mr. Pouliot if he meant by outside translation, translations done outside his own department but in the service, or outside the service.

Mr. POULIOT: I mean both, translation that is made by the service outside of the unit, and translation that is made by foreigners.

The WITNESS: Well, I think I could perhaps get that.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Bland.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to have also the average number of letters which are translated.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: I asked Mr. Bland for that. That was one of the questions I asked Mr. Bland to incorporate in his report.

Mr. POULIOT: Therefore it would be pretty hard to call witnesses before we receive that.

The WITNESS: That is something, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to point out; that should, I think, be kept separate from actual translation. We have been dealing so far with what we might call actual translation. Correspondence translation would not necessarily be done by the same people at all.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was going to suggest on that point, that in some of the departments there are technical translators, if I might call them such, and those who might do ordinary correspondence translation.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Now, if you can separate them for us—A. I think there should be a separation.

Q. To my mind, they ought to be separate?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And besides that, the list which you have given to us, Mr. Bland, mentions that in thirty out of forty-five units there are translators and that in the balance of fifteen there are none. There is some translation that is done there by secretaries or clerks or stenographers?—A. Yes, I think probably quite likely in every unit there is some translation of correspondence done by the staff, but I was treating that as a separate thing.

Q. Yes, I know?—A. I will try and get both.

Q. But in fact, in each unit the routine work can be translated at hand?—A. Yes. I was taking it for granted that routine work did not come within the scope of the consideration of the committee at all. That is being done at the present time by the unit staff.

Mr. MACINNIS: Would it not be better to rule that out rather than put anyone to the trouble of collecting information in regard to it, if we are only interested in translation work done by translators, so-called? Would that be sufficient?

Mr. POULIOT: No, no. It is most important to know about the work which is done by the civil service and the work which is done outside the civil service.

The WITNESS: I will try and get the whole thing, as far as I can.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Perhaps if that information were available and these witnesses that you have referred to, then we could get down to a discussion of the bill, clause by clause.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you this, after we have got that information from Mr. Bland about the outside translation, we will have to know how much it costs.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: He is bringing that down. Now, is there anything else?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, the fact is I did overlook this: At the last meeting of the committee the Chairman had asked the clerk to prepare a certain memorandum worked out from the figures that Mr. Gerin had given as to the working hours and we were furnished with the statement which was simply filed, but which did not constitute evidence, because I took objection at the time; you will remember that I did not want that statement to be conclusive when it was just filed. A few hours later, after the memorandum was published in the papers, I received a statement which I took the liberty upon myself to give to the press. It showed a discrepancy between the statement that Mr. Fraser prepared and the one that these interested parties had prepared. There is no blame to be attached to anybody, to Mr. Fraser for having prepared it, because he prepared it according to the data that he had. Since then I have been handed two memorandums, one correcting slightly the one that was given to the press and another one that shows the relative standing of the parliamentary translators, in so far as their privileges are concerned, with reference to the civil service. I could recall a witness and have him produce it, but I thought if I just handed it in, had copies made, without any character of conclusiveness attaching to it, that I could simply file it and let it go in.

Mr. ERNST: Who prepared it?

Mr. CHEVRIER: One of the staff, one of the civil servants.

Mr. MACINNIS: You did not intend it for the record?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Did the other one go in the record?

Mr. MACINNIS: I don't think so. You said a moment ago that it didn't.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If it didn't go in the record, I don't want this to go into the record. I would like to file it and have copies made available.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are you going to have copies distributed to the members?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I can have copies made and given to them.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Or give it to Mr. Fraser, and he can distribute copies. It is just for information, the statement you handed to the clerk?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Yes, it is not evidence.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, Mr. Bland, there is just one thing I would like to make clear before having the report on the amount of translations outside of the service; could we have it for a few years, in order to know the cost by years??—A. I will try to get anything you want, Mr. Pouliot; if that is desired I will have to get it from the department.

Q. Will you get that??—A. I will try to get it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: An approximate estimate might suit your purpose.

Mr. POULIOT: If we had the yearly average that might do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If you could fix that approximately, Mr. Bland.

The WITNESS: I will try to do that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It might take too much time to await replies from all of the departments.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. When do you expect to get it for us?—A. We will start on it immediately, and I expect we may be able to have it by the next meeting.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You will try to have it by the next meeting?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. We will have to get it a little in advance, to see whether it is of interest or not?—A. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, as soon as we get anything in worth considering we will put it in; I understand that the committee wish to get it at the earliest opportunity.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Bland.

The witness was discharged.

The committee adjourned at 5.25 p.m., to meet again at 11 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday, April 18, 1934.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 5

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1934

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1934

WITNESSES:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.

O. Paradis, Chief, Law Branch, House of Commons.

E. H. Coleman, Under-Secretary of State.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 18, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, Bowman, MacInnis, Chevrier, and Pouliot.

The committee gave brief consideration to matters connected with Bill No. 4.

Mr. C. W. Bland was in attendance and filed a statement of the Units comprised in the Public Service and the number of translators attached to each Unit. (Copies were handed to committee members.)

This statement will appear in the next number of the printed Proceedings and Evidence.

The committee then took under consideration the several requests filed by various associations, groups and individuals for personal attendance before the committee or by the submission of written representations.

These several requests were considered separately and decision arrived at as to their disposal.

Further consideration of Bill No. 4 to be the order of business at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, April 25th, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of the Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, Bowman, MacInnis, Pouliot and Chevrier.

The Committee again took under consideration Bill No. 4.

Mr. O. Paradis, Chief of the House of Commons Law Translation Branch was called, examined and discharged.

Mr. C. W. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, appeared and filed correspondence between the Commission and the several departments and units of government and the returns made thereby, respecting translation staff and translation work; also a Summary of such returns prepared by the Commission.

Copies of the aforesaid Summary were placed in the hands of the committee members.

The committee took recess at 1 p.m.

The committee re-convened at 2 p.m., Mr. Lawson in the Chair.

The examination of Mr. Bland was resumed and concluded. Witness retired.

Mr. E. H. Coleman, Under-Secretary of State was called, examined and discharged.

The committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 2, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
WEDNESDAY, April 25, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, shall we proceed?

I understand that Mr. Paradis, Chief of the Law Translation Branch, has been here two or three times; would it be satisfactory to the committee if we have Mr. Paradis first.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I thought that probably the suggestion I had made at a previous meeting might reach the authorities, and that some statement might have been made as to the suggestion that I had made at the time.

Mr. POULIOT: What was your suggestion?

Mr. CHEVRIER: It appears at page 95 of report and it would also appear in the transcription of the notes as to whether the parliamentary branch would be kept separate; with a few other suggestions. Mr. Bowman at the last meeting made a synopsis in three lines of exactly what I suggested. I might just supplement that by saying that during the discussion in the House, at page 1328 of the Debates, one of the outstanding members of the opposition, Mr. Gagnon, stated: "We have voted on bills before, which have gone to a committee and come back in a state hardly recognizable. Why should it be otherwise with this legislation?" I said: "We hope so".

Mr. Duranleau, Minister of Marine, in the course of the discussion (at page 1328) said: "This would be referred to a committee where suggestions would be received in the way of amendment"; and then further on in the discussion Mr. Veniot is speaking; and the Hon. Secretary of State was pleased to say the same thing in the same way again.

I am not saying this in any acrimonious way, but if I was to understand that any suggestions that might be made, or any amendments that I might feel like moving, will not, as a matter of principle, be accepted before the committee, then I think it will be a case of "love's labour lost". Therefore, as we have nothing further in that line this morning I am quite prepared to listen to the evidence that may be submitted. But I suggested that line of conduct with a view to shortening the number of witnesses I might like to have had; and if there is nothing out in the way of an olive branch, then it may be that at the next meeting of the committee I may ask for two or three more witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier, so far as I am concerned, I have not taken a position that the bill could not be amended before this committee. This committee can consider anything it wishes, and make a report to the House with respect thereto, and if the committee reports the bill with amendments, it is so reported, as far as I am concerned. But I know of no course of procedure that you can adopt without the common consent of all the members of the committee other than to proceed and consider the bill clause by clause, when, as and if you gentlemen have finished calling witnesses.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Your stand, Mr. Chairman, is quite consistent; but with a view to shortening the evidence that I had in mind I just made that suggestion; and, of course, we have not yet started to consider the bill clause by clause. But had I had a reasonable assurance that the suggestions which I

had made would have been accepted, then of course I would have made up my mind at once. That not being so, and we not having yet reached the stage where these amendments can be properly made, I will not say anything further; but just reserve my right nevertheless to call other witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not discussed the matter with any member of the committee, or with anyone else.

Mr. POULIOT: But naturally when you spoke of common consent it means that the committee might reach common agreement.

The CHAIRMAN: It might.

Mr. POULIOT: By discussing the amendments that would be proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for the committee to decide.

Now I will call Mr. Paradis.

Mr. OSCAR PARADIS, K.C., called.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, Mr. Paradis?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Paradis, will you give your evidence in French or in English?—

A. It is immaterial to me, I presume the committee would prefer that I speak in English.

Q. In English. Mr. Paradis, you are the Chief Law Translator of the House of Commons?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please tell the committee what you have to say with regard to the translations made by your branch?—A. I made this statement as short as possible. It answers a questionnaire put by the committee of enquiry on printing and stationery. It is not very long. Question No. 7, on Translations by the Law Translation Branch of the House of Commons. Question 2: what publications, etc., are translated (a) into French, (b) into English?

(a) The publications translated into French in the Law Translation Branch of the House of Commons consist mostly of Public and Private Bills which commence to arrive from the Law Branch of the House of Commons during the course of about three months before the opening of the annual session and continue thereafter to issue forth increasingly until the prorogation of Parliament.

(b) Translation of Bills from French into English may occur occasionally, but such translation is seldom asked for.

Question 3. What is the procedure, in respect of the Department, preliminary to printing?

How are the texts of translations prepared for the printer? For instance, in typewritten form or otherwise?

Are both the French and English texts sent simultaneously to the Printing Bureau?

Are translations of a single document made by only one translator or are they often made in parts, by several translators respectively? In the latter case, what is the co-ordinating process before going to the printer?

Explain also the procedure regarding the correction of proofs in force so as to reduce to a minimum the cost entailed in the issuance of several proofs.

Rule 72 of the standing orders of the House of Commons reads as follows:

"72. All bills shall be printed before the second reading in the English and French languages."

Therefore, pursuant to the Rules of the House, Public and Private Bills must be laid on the table of the House for second reading simultaneously in both the English and the French languages, otherwise they cannot be proceeded with,

which means that the translation of said Bills must be accomplished without delay. As soon as a Bill is introduced for first reading in the House, order for distribution is immediately issued from the Law Branch and a similar order emanates from the Law Translation Branch. The Bill is accordingly distributed in print the following day in both the French and English languages.

The texts of translations prepared for the printer are always in typewritten form. The French and English texts are not sent simultaneously to the Printing Bureau. The French version, which is mostly translated from the printed copy of the English text, follows the latter by a day or two, according to the length of the Bill.

The translation of single documents of ordinary length is performed by one translator; in the case of legislation of considerable length, the work is accomplished by two translators in collaboration so that co-ordination be strictly adhered to from beginning to end. All translation, whether done by one translator or by more than one translator, is thoroughly and carefully revised by the Chief Law Translator and one member of his staff jointly, before any text is sent to the Printing Bureau. This is followed by three other revisions: first, upon the introduction of the Bill; second, upon its passing; and finally for the making and publishing of the yearly Statutes.

As regards the issuance, correction and number of proofs, the Law Translation Branch adheres strictly, at all times, to the procedure followed by the Law Clerks of the House, with respect to the English version.

The British North America Act, section 133, renders imperative the publication of the Dominion Statutes in both the English and the French languages:

133. Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the Debates of the Houses of the Parliament of Canada and of the House of the Legislature of Quebec; and both languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of these Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from all or any of the Courts of Quebec.

The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both of those languages.

It must be borne in mind, therefore, that after an Act has been passed by Parliament, and sanctioned and assented to by the Governor General, both the English and the French versions constitute the law and are each and both originals of said law. The French version is no more a translation, but it becomes an original text. Should a difference be subsequently discovered in the wording to the extent of giving a construction in the French language different from that intended by the English version of an Act, there is no other remedy to render the versions identical but to apply to Parliament for the passing of an Amending Act, as both versions constitute the law. This principle has been established by the Courts of Justice and followed by the Department of Justice.

After the prorogation of the House, the Law Translators commence the making of the Yearly Statutes, French version, in co-operation with the Law Branch who make the English version. This task has always formed part of the immediate duties of the Law Translators; it lasts from six weeks to two months according to the length of the session and the activities of the Printing Bureau. The Chief Law Translator is then personally required to revise very carefully the entire legislation, French version, passed by both Houses of Parliament (House of Commons and Senate), after which he finally signs the order for distribution of the French version.

Q. Just a moment, Mr. Paradis: do you make the French index also?—

A. Oh, yes, the index is included in the Statutes.

Q. I know, but do you make it?—A. Certainly. Besides the Public and Private Acts passed by Parliament and assented to by the Governor General, the Statutes comprise certain Acts of the Imperial Statutes, Imperial Orders in Council, Proclamations, Treaties and Commercial Conventions with Foreign countries, and Orders in Council of the Governor General in Council of Canada, all the translation of which is required to be accomplished by the Law Translation Branch, immediately after the sessional work itself is terminated, and incorporated in the annual Statutes.

I might add that there are many Orders in Council which are not published in the Canada Gazette, on things which sometimes are very very confidential, and the translation of which has to be done by the translation branch; not all the work we do is incorporated in the Statutes. We have also intersessional work, government contracts, commercial agreements and the like.

Furthermore, for the information of the Committee and in justice to the Law Translation Branch, it may be added that the legislation as it is published in the Yearly Dominion Statutes does not represent the entire work accomplished by the Law Translators during the session. A custom has been adopted in recent years to insert explanatory notes which appear opposite the different sections of Bills introduced before the House. These explanatory notes are for the immediate information of the members of Parliament regarding the intent and construction of sections of the Acts. Said notes oftentimes take as much space, if not more, than the sections referred to. They are deleted after the Bill has been adopted by Parliament and are not published in the Statute.

Now may I add that before a bill is presented in the House it is drafted by a council, it is very often printed and returned to council which redrafts and returns it several times and it is likewise translated and printed before the time the bill is agreed upon and accepted and presented for first reading in the House. It may likewise be stated that Bills are often reprinted several times after reference to committees, and the translation work entailed by the several reprints does not appear in the final text as passed by the House.

Q. How long does it take to prepare the French index?—A. That would not take very long.

Q. But it must be done with care?—A. Yes.

Q. And do you revise the proofs?—A. We revise them four times before they are introduced, I think I mentioned that. We revise them before they are first sent to the printing bureau.

Q. You revise them on typewritten copies?—A. Yes, and then we revise them when they come back in printed copies.

Q. And at times the printed bills are submitted to you before you get the typewritten copy?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Therefor, is the revision of proofs more extensive than it is of printed matter?—A. I have not the least idea of the extent. I have one bill here which I would like to show you.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Just a moment, about the index?—A. We index all the published Acts, index the private Acts, index the marginal notes; and the index of the Revised Statutes are included in the New Statutes every year—with the additions we make every year. There are five indices.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. By looking at the index of this year we see what legislation has been passed since the Revised Statutes of 1927?—A. And even as far back as 1906, the former revision of the statutes too.

Q. Could you tell the committee if it would be cheaper to make proof revision on typewritten pages instead of on printed copies?—A. I could not say that. I will tell you why: here is a copy of the Bank Act as we received it—all the printed copy—that was in the latter part of November or December.

Q. Was the House sitting then?—A. No.

Q. But the translators were on the job?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. I just wanted to show that because the idea is abroad that from the time the House prorogued until around the 25th January everyone was away enjoying an easy life?—A. We are here the year around. After the session, as I say, it takes about two months to fix up the statutes for printing at the Bureau; and then the bills and the legislation for the following session begin to come in about the middle of the fall. This year we have been working on the Bank Act. I did not bring that here because it would take a truck. We had the Bank Act, the Excise Act, and the Companies Act, three tremendous bills.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And you received that bill when the House was not sitting, early in November, and went ahead working on it?—A. Yes. Now this bill I have here, bill 19, comprises 24 pages. Here is the bill as we received it, the English copy.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me a moment, Mr. Paradis. I have no desire to curtail in any way any of the evidence that Mr. Pouliot and Mr. Chevrier desire to bring to the committee; but are we really concerned in the volume of work that this may involve.

Mr. POULIOT: I will explain to you why I asked that question. I asked it to bring out the amount of work which is done by that office. It is of interest to us.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we all know that very well.

Mr. POULIOT: You know, because you are a lawyer; but there are others.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. MacInnis knows it very well.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think after what has been said in the House, and the Secretary of State said it very kindly, that this matter would be investigated in all its phases, I think it is rather interesting to see all these proofs.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I have just one thing to add to-day; it is that there are just a few translators in the branch. How many are there, Mr. Paradis?—A. Three.

Q. Including yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. And in my humble point of view they do the most important business of the whole translation service, because Parliament is working on the making of laws and uses the versions of the original bill in French and English and it is important that there should be no discrepancy between each version. Therefore it seems to me that the evidence given by Mr. Paradis is both trite and to the point as to its importance, because that phase is vital in the parliamentary system in regard to the enactment of laws. If that work were not properly done it might cause very serious damage on account of the wrong interpretation of the law. That is all I have to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no desire to curtail it, I merely make the suggestion for your consideration.

Mr. POULIOT: Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I meant to discuss the importance of the French and English versions, because I am sure the committee will agree on that.

The CHAIRMAN: We all agree that it is very important that they should be accurate.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Just one more question, Mr. Paradis: as you are one of the chief officers of the House of Commons, may I ask you if in your belief the centralization of translations would improve the translation of laws as it is done now?—A. Well, in my humble opinion, it would mean the disorganization of our office completely. That office has been closely connected with the Law Branch since 1857; that is ten years before Confederation, and they had always worked together formerly.

Q. The Chief Translator was near the Law Clerk?—A. Yes, and we still are; the two rooms have been together ever since practically it came into existence. We get our work immediately from the law branch, and we communicate with them about fifty times a day.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Will it disorganize your department if you are removed to some other place?—A. What could we do in another department with our translations?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. If you move out of where you are now it will cause a disorganization of your office?—A. Absolutely.

Q. And if you stay there you do not see the use for a superintendent?—A. I do not know what information he could give me better than the Minister of Justice.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you mean to say if you move from the second floor to the fourth floor it will disorganize your work?—A. It will, because we are always together, I mean we work together.

Q. You could work together downstairs.—A. We would have to go upstairs fifty times a day.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If that were the only effect of the Bill that in itself would be a handicap, but if it is going to mean, as I apprehend, taking them away into some far corner of the city then I can well understand; that is what I am trying to find out.

The CHAIRMAN: Might not your apprehension be totally unfounded? You are going to have a Civil Service committee sitting next session, and I presume other sessions as well, and if the superintendent of translations rearranges matters so that it is not in the best interests of the service, and the House of Commons, and so forth, I imagine that the members will be very quick to lay their complaints before the committee, and the Civil Service committee would be very quick to investigate them and to recommend any necessary changes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If next year the members of the Civil Service committee reporting on any Bill have as much latitude as some of us have now in bringing in amendments, then the thing is a foregone conclusion.

Mr. POULIOT: And moreover, Mr. Chairman, it is much better not to offer any objections and complaints.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I have just one more question. Between sessions, and during the session, are you in close touch with the Department of Justice and the Privy Council?—A. No, but the law branch is.

Q. Yes, but when you receive the first draft of a Bill, and the other drafts until the Bill is presented to the House of Commons, is your work of a confidential nature?—A. Absolutely. We are not even allowed to say what Bills we have in hand. We are under the strictest secrecy.

Q. And, therefore, the government might submit a Bill to you, have it translated, and then not present it to the House of Commons, and no one would hear of it.—A. Every session we have ten or twelve Bills that are not introduced.

Q. But they are never mentioned by anybody?—A. No.

By Mr. Lawrin:

Q. When you receive from a department a draft to be translated, is it done right away?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you immediately translate a Bill when you receive it?—A. As soon as it comes in we set to work right away.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I wish you would give the committee the processes in connection with that Bill which you have there and which you have referred to.—A. Here is a Bill that comes from Council; it is printed—

Q. Mr. Paradis, will you start from the time that you received that Bill that you mentioned, you said you received it on the 20th of November last year. If the committee will bear with me, I would like to ask that question, to show the committee just what happened from that day down.—A. This is the Bank of Canada Bill which was first called the Central Reserve Bank. It came to us in printed form; we translate it, and print it; this is the first draft; it goes back to council, before the council of ministers, and it is redrafted there.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It comes back in typewritten form?—A. Oh no, there is nothing that goes in typewritten form before the council of ministers, everything has to be printed.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. The Bill when drafted was drafted in English?—A. Yes.

Q. And then it was sent to the Printing Bureau and printed in English?—A. Yes.

Q. And then it was sent to your department for translation?—A. Yes. As soon as it comes back from the Printing Bureau we get it. Now, that goes back to council for revision. Here is the second draft made by council, with all those changes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. After it had been printed?—A. Yes, after it had been printed. Then it comes back and we translate it again; and this second Bill, on the 6th of February goes back to council, and here are the changes.

Q. After it had gone to the Printing Bureau to be reprinted?—A. Yes.

Q. So that that increases the cost of translation?—A. The cost of translating is exactly the same cost as that of printing.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But you are not a printer, you are a law translator.—A. As far as the cost is concerned, I do not know.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Mr. Paradis, when the Bill goes through council for redrafting or revision, then before it comes back to you for translation it is sent to the Printing Bureau and reprinted?—A. Yes.

Q. And you translate the redrafted Bill?—A. The redraft, and we send it to the Printing Bureau and then back to council.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Paradis, how many times do you have to send it to the Printing Bureau after you had received it from council?—A. Five times.

Q. And the copy you received from council was amended?—A. Yes.

Q. And printed?—A. Yes. Sometimes we get it in typewritten form.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. This is a very important Bill. Do you mean to say that all the bills are redrafted three, four or five times?—A. Yes.

Q. Every time?—A. Not every time. Some of them are not touched. Take the Marine Bill—

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. What was the approximate number of pages in the Marine Bill?—A. The Marine Bill had 550 pages, that is besides reprints. We began that in the House of Commons and it was transferred to the Senate.

Q. Now, Mr. Paradis, I wish to have that understood clearly; you receive one printed copy of the Bank Bill as the first step in your work?—A. Yes.

Q. And you work on it, with the amendments that were in typewritten form from council?—A. Yes.

Q. And then you made that translation and sent it to the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was sent again to council?—A. Yes. I gave it to the law clerk and he sent it in.

Q. But it was sent again to council?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. When you receive a first draft you make a translation of it?—A. Yes.

Q. And then you send it to the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they make two printings, one in French and one in English?—A. Yes, French and English; they have two staffs.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Will you tell us how many times that Bill was sent to the Printing Bureau with the translation and the corrections made by council before the Bill was presented to the House?—A. Five times.

Q. It was printed five times?—A. Printed five times.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And translated five times?—A. Translated five times. I have five proofs here.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. With the amendments?—A. With the amendments and corrections made by council. And that is just one Bill.

Q. Now, Mr. Paradis, is it necessary to have uniformity in the translation of law?—A. Absolutely.

Q. Yes, and all three in your branch have a special training in the translation of law?—A. Yes. The chief law translator of the House has always been a lawyer.

Q. You are a lawyer yourself?—A. Yes.

Q. And a King's Counsel?—A. Yes.

Q. And, Mr. Paradis, will you please tell the committee if the work that you do could be just as well done if it was distributed amongst eighty translators?—A. I do not think so. I cannot see how it could be. It is a specialization by legal men.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That Bill got to you on the 20th of November last year?—A. The Bank Bill, and we have been on it for over three months; that is consolidation.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. When a Bill is adopted by parliament and the printing of it is completed, then copies in French and in English are sent to the public?—A. Oh, well, they are sent separately. You can have them any time after they have passed the House.

Q. I would like to know at what time we can have those Bills in French and in English after they have been adopted by parliament?—A. As soon as they are passed.

Q. How many days?—A. Next day.

Q. Then how can you explain that in some departments it takes fifteen or eighteen months for some translation work to be done?—A. I know nothing about that, but I do know that as soon as a Bill has passed parliament anybody can have a copy at the distribution office.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We have them every day on our files and that shows the efficiency of the branch.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What are your daily hours of work, Mr. Paradis?—A. We arrive at ten o'clock and we stay till one; and then we are there from half past two till six, and from eight o'clock till the adjournment of the House.

Q. That is, during the session?—A. Yes, during the session, and very often after eleven o'clock, because everything that is done in the House—the introduction of Bills, and second and third readings—is sent to the Printing Bureau the very same night.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And if there are four or five amendments brought in just before eleven o'clock you have to translate them before going home?—A. Yes. We send them to the Printing Bureau during the night.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do you have a usual vacation?—A. A vacation?

Q. Yes?—A. Well, as I tell you, it takes about two months to accomplish our work after the session is over. After that we may have about two months and a half or three months' vacation. That will be about the middle of August, say.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. If the session does not last until August.—A. I say two months after prorogation.

The CHAIRMAN: I might suggest, Mr. MacInnis kept very quiet while the rest of you were asking questions and he is having his first innings. I suggest you let him ask his questions.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think that is all I want to ask.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Paradis, you told Mr. MacInnis that during the session you worked from ten till one, and then after that?—A. And from half past two till six.

Q. And at night from eight?—A. To the adjournment of the House.

Q. And sometimes after that?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Supposing we say twelve o'clock.—A. Well, that would be any time there is nothing changed during the evening, such as introduction of Bills, or amendments, or third readings.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Or motions?—A. No, we have nothing to do with motions.

By the Chairman:

Q. Now then, during recess, Mr. Paradis, I understand that after the adjournment of the House it is necessary to keep your staff a matter of two months, do you say?—A. Yes, between six weeks and two months.

Q. We will say seven weeks, that is an average, seven weeks after the House adjourns, and during that period, I presume, you do not work the same hours as during the session?—A. No, no.

Q. And during that period are your hours pretty much the same as the civil servants?—A. About.

Q. About the same, six and a half hours a day?—A. About.

Q. And then you are able to get away from that period until sometime preceding the next session?—A. The next session, yes.

Q. And how is the date of your return preceding the next session determined? I mean, do you just automatically come back a month or so before the session?—A. As far as I am personally concerned, I never go out of Ottawa; I am always at my office.

Q. How do you work it with your translators? Let us take last session: Last year the House adjourned early in June, my recollection is.

Mr. MACINNIS: May 27th.

By the Chairman:

Q. Well then, by the end of July your translators would be able to get away in the ordinary course of events?—A. Yes.

Q. And how do you determine when they come back? Do you send for them when you want them?—A. They generally come back in September for the opening of the schools.

Q. You mean they come back to the City of Ottawa?—A. Yes.

Q. I mean, do they come back to work in their offices?—A. Yes.

Q. They come back to their offices?—A. Not as regularly, because we have not much work.

Q. That is what I am trying to get at.—A. But they are available at any time.

Q. Well then, can I put it this way: That from early in September they are available?—A. Yes.

Q. And subject to call from you?—A. Yes, because they come to the office every day.

Q. So that if there is some statute, or something of that kind, which requires to be translated during the months preceding the opening of the session, and those are received by you from the law clerk, then you requisition sufficient of your staff to do that work?—A. Oh yes.

Q. If something was required to be translated, however, that was not a matter of a statute then you would not call on your staff to translate it; that would go to some other branch?—A. No, because all that comes to us is all legal matter, and we do not send that outside.

Q. Now then, Mr. Paradis, will you tell me this: Assume that a translation bureau was established, and your law translation branch was still a branch of that bureau and you were still its chief, wherein would its efficiency be injured? Now first, you have told us it would be injured if you moved

the law translators from the office of that adjoining the law clerk. Are there any other ways, or means, or factors by which the efficiency of your branch would be affected?—A. Well, the efficiency would not be affected at all as long as the superintendent does not come, but we will have to give him some information.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It would give you more trouble and it would not improve the business?

—A. Certainly. I have been there for thirty years now, since I have been in the House of Commons.

By the Chairman:

Q. Wherein would it give you more trouble if there was a translation bureau and a superintendent of that bureau?—A. We would have to give him information all the time.

Q. Well, at the present time to whom do you give information?—A. Well, we deal with the law clerk all the time.

Q. You deal with the law clerk and the law clerk only?—A. Yes, and the clerk of the House.

Q. That is what I thought. You are now under Dr. Beauchesne, the clerk of the House?—A. Yes.

Q. With super-imposed upon him, as the head, the speaker of the House of Commons?—A. Certainly.

Q. So that at the present time you have to give information, to the extent to which it is sought, to Dr. Beauchesne; and if a bureau were established, you would have to give that same information to the superintendent of the bureau, would you not?—A. Dr. Beauchesne does not bother us much.

Q. He does not bother you?—A. No.

Q. Well, that may or may not be credible to him.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It shows he has great confidence in his staff.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. I mean that he does not interfere with us at all.

Q. If the superintendent did not interfere too much would you be all right?—A. It would take us out of parliament, and I maintain that this law translation branch, which used to be called before the Law and Translation Branch since before Confederation—

By the Chairman:

Q. Well now, I think we are getting down to the pith of the thing, Mr. Paradis. Your second objection is not as to the matter of efficiency but to establishing this bureau which you think would take your law translators from under the direct jurisdiction and control of parliament?—A. Yes.

Q. How many years have you been with the law translation branch, Mr. Paradis?—A. Thirty years.

Q. Well then, were you there at a time when the House of Commons, for example, had its own printing establishment and used to print all its own bills?—A. No, that was before my time.

Q. Do you know that there was a time when they did that?—A. I never heard of it.

Q. Well, I may tell you, for your information, there was a time when parliament had its own printing establishment, and printed its own bills and everything.—A. Well, they could not do that now.

Q. Now it all goes to a Printing Bureau. Then, Mr. Paradis, you probably agree with me, that you would not suggest that the Printing Bureau of to-day should be broken up and have one printing establishment printing for one, two, or three departments, and the House of Commons having its own printing establishment, and the Senate its own, and so forth?—A. Oh, that is outside of my province.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Civil Service Commission have a printing establishment.

The CHAIRMAN: Well then we might consider consolidating it with the bureau.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You might ask them whether they would allow it. I would be the last one to admit it, because there are certain things there that are absolutely confidential.

The WITNESS: I know that as far as I am concerned, we are not allowed to say anything before a bill is introduced.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, quite so; I realize that.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It is strictly confidential and highly technical?—A. Yes, it is legal matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions, gentlemen? We are very glad to have you here this morning, Mr. Paradis.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Lawson.

Witness retired.

C. H. BLAND, recalled.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, just before Mr. Bland starts, there is a letter here from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission enclosing data and information requested by this committee. It includes a list of translators, by departments, showing the amount of translation work done for the last two years, translations done by another unit, by other branches of the service; and translation done outside the unit by persons outside the service, with the names of the translators and the cost of same; copies of the commission's report to the Senate, 1924; and a brief report on the surveying and mapping services. The letter from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, dated April 1, 1934, enclosing this information, is as follows:—

I am enclosing herewith information requested by the committee:—

1. A list of translators, by departments, showing numbers, amount of translation work done for the last two years, translations done outside a unit by other branches of the service, and translations done outside a unit by persons outside the service with the names of translators and cost of same.

2. Copies of the commission's report to the Senate, 1924.

I am also enclosing the returns regarding translation work of departments and other units which show in detail the information which has been summarized.

Then there is also a letter from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission to the clerk of the committee dated April 25, 1934:—

Before the commission's circular letter 1934-4 was sent out on April 13th it was ascertained that a large number of the units of the government service did not keep records of letters translated and, as it was considered that unless a complete picture could be presented, this information would have little or no value, the circular requested information only as regards other translation work.

If the committee considers that partial information in this regard will be of value, the commission will of course endeavour to obtain it but, judging from the amount of such work done in the commission of which no record is kept, no reliable record would be presented.

Now gentlemen, we have Mr. Bland available, as requested.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Just before you proceed, Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made repeatedly in various quarters, and here too, that the cost of translation would run up to \$75,000. That is a statement of the utmost importance in this matter, and I would ask Mr. Bland, first, for the details. Mr. Bland himself said it would cost \$75,000, and he said that he would furnish us with the details of the \$75,000. Have we got that?

The WITNESS: I am glad Mr. Chevrier brought up that question, Mr. Chairman, because we want to put on record the exact figures for the last year, as I have secured them from the printing bureau. In the first place, however, I would like to make it clear, I think what my statement referred to was not the cost of translation, but the cost of what is known technically as authors' corrections; and in answer to Mr. Chevrier's question at the time, I said that this did not comprise only French but English as well. For the last year, the cost of those corrections—I mean at the printing bureau—amounted to \$58,805.25 which, it will be noted, is a considerable reduction from the figure of \$75,000 that was provided for 1931-32.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But can we get the details of that?—A. As regards the detail, I endeavoured to secure from the printing bureau the exact break-down of that amount so as to show just how much each department was responsible for, and so on, but the printing bureau did not have it. It could be secured if about 20,000, what they call, job bags were gone through and analysed.

Q. Why shouldn't it be done?—A. If the committee wants it, we will be glad to get it.

Q. I am going to insist on having it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. It means charging it to each department to make up that total.—A. I think I can get it fairly readily by departments. The difficulty was to divide it into individual units.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I want to find out what the cost of corrections have been in both English and French, because we have been told that the French translation cost a tremendous proportion of that \$75,000, or probably the \$58,000. It is only fair, that if anybody makes a statement, particularly from the printing bureau, that they should substantiate it, and if they can give the lump sum I see no particular reason why they could not eventually give the details, because in order to come to the lump sum they must have had the details.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier, is not your only desire to get a lump sum aggregate as to authors' corrections of English text and of French text?

The CHAIRMAN: Is not your only desire to get the lump sum, the aggregate, of these two phases; the corrections of the English, and the corrections of the French translations. We are really not concerned with the way it is distributed to departmental units or branches or anything else.

Mr. POULIOT: I want to find out what the cost of the corrections has been in the English and in the French, so that we can find out whether the statement should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN: But you are really only interested in the aggregates, you do not need to know the detailed items.

Mr. POULIOT: I want to find out what branch is responsible for making the most corrections.

The WITNESS: If you will allow me to make that clear, Mr. Chairman: we are only too happy to get what the committee wants; to get this information from the printing bureau, they say would require the work of a clerk for about a month. We will get it if you want it.

Mr. POULIOT: I want to get it, I think we as a committee ought to know.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. What is the total?—A. \$58,805.25.

Q. It is very precise, they include the 25 cents?—A. They do.

Q. Therefore, the total amount should be made known by the segregation, or addition of each item?—A. Yes.

Q. And each item must be charged to the department concerned?—A. They could make a classification by items quite readily, the difficulty is that in the items they did not differentiate between the English and the French.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The point is that certain corrections are due to translators making corrections in the copy; and in certain cases that must of necessity happen, and then certain corrections are made by the printing bureau, and my information, right or wrong—whether it be right or wrong I am not prepared to say—is that corrections made by the printing bureau on translation work is not charged separately from the cost of printing, but is charged up to the cost of translation; that is what I want to get at?—A. I will try to get that particular point cleared up.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Before proceeding with the examination of Mr. Bland, Mr. Lemaire, Clerk of the Privy Council, the other day tabled two orders in council. Item No. 3—P.C.-2095, of August 31, 1931; and item No. 31, P.C. No. 2611, of Nov. 8, 1930. Will you please tell the committee if these Orders in Council relate to a translator, and if so, to whom?—A. The first order in council to which you refer, Mr. Pouliot, is P.C. 2958 of the 10th December, 1920. That is the first one filed by Mr. Lemaire.

Q. No, no, it is on page 70 at the bottom of the page; there are two orders in council, P.C. 2095, and P.C. 2611?—A. P.C. 3-2095 (to give it its full detail) has to do with the organization of the department of the secretary of state, and adds to that organization one position of principal translator.

Q. Yes, and on whose file is it?—A. It appears on the file of Mr. J. P. D. VanVeen.

The CHAIRMAN: What does that mean, "appears on the file."

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. There is no name named in the order in council. I would like to know for whom it is passed?—A. The position created by this order in council was subsequently filled by the transfer of Mr. VanVeen.

Q. Therefore, that order in council concerns Mr. VanVeen?—A. The position referred to in the order in council was subsequently filled by Mr. VanVeen.

Q. In accordance with the order in council?—A. The order in council does not refer to Mr. VanVeen by name at all.

Q. But he had the advantage of it?—A. Oh yes, quite so.

By the Chairman:

Q. I presume that was done quite in accordance with the Civil Service Act and Regulations?—A. Oh yes, quite.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Did any other translator take advantage of that particular order in council?—A. No, because under the Civil Service Act the position in question was filled by the transfer of Mr. VanVeen; this is a matter relating to the two departments concerned.

Q. What about the other one, No. P.C. 31-2611?—A. Order in council 31-2611 grants authority for the continuance of the temporary position of senior translator in the Department of the Interior for a period of one year from October 8, 1930.

Q. Yes, and who took advantage of that?—A. That position was filled by Mr. M. H. Arnoni.

Q. Presently a translator at the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Lemaire did not mention for what P.C. 2958 of December 16, 1920, was passed?—A. That order in council, I think, Mr. Pouliot, was a general order in council providing for the granting of permanent status to civil servants generally, not to any specific one person.

Q. Did Mr. VanVeen take advantage of that?—A. I think Mr. VanVeen was given permanency under the provisions of the separate order in council.

Q. Now, will you please tell the committee on what date the memo entitled "translators in the public service" and containing five pages was prepared by the commission?—A. What date is that? Perhaps if I could see it, I could identify it better, Mr. Pouliot.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that some document which we all have?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The WITNESS: I do not see the date on that, Mr. Pouliot, but I imagine it would be—

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. In the first part of April?—A. No, I should think it would be more likely in the early part of March.

The CHAIRMAN: What was it you wanted to know about this statement, Mr. Pouliot, when this document was prepared?

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. By the commission; Mr. Bland says that early in March. Now, there is another one here which has been supplied to the members of the committee. It mentions the units and the numbers of translators?—A. That is a more recent one, that was prepared in the middle of April.

The CHAIRMAN: That is this, "Distribution of translators."

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Yes, two pages, in the middle of April; and that memorandum on the reorganization of government departments or branches has a date of April 15, 1924?—A. Yes.

Q. When was the summary of translation work, nine pages, prepared?—A. Between April 13th and April 21st.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Of 1934?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Did you have the information which is included therein when the commission drafted the three other documents to which mention has been made?—A. No, this information—the nine pages to which you have just referred—was only secured after April 13, at the request of the committee.

Q. Yes, but that is not an answer to my question; what I want to know is this, does the Civil Service Commission have that information at hand before it received it from the Department?—A. No.

Q. Therefore, when in 1924 in the memorandum of reorganization of government departments and branches, the Commission advocated the provision of a Central Translating Service, it did not have the information which is included in the list which you have before you?—A. At that time, ten years ago, it based its report upon the information which was available at that time; it is not the same information as that which has now been secured.

Q. It was not as complete?—A. It was complete for that period.

Q. Yes, but it was not the same kind of information?—A. I could only find that out by looking up the old files and letting you have a copy of the information we had then.

The CHAIRMAN: And it might be as difficult to define information “of a class and kind,” as it very often is in the case of defining goods “of a class and kind” under the Customs Act.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The letters which are before you bear a number?—A. From the departments, each letter, yes.

Q. Will you please put them before you?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please take No. 16, the Library of Parliament?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any translation made there?—A. No, the reply of the parliamentary librarian is that there is no translation done in the library of parliament.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is the date of that letter?—A. April 15, 1934.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But you know, Mr. Bland, that there are two Deputy Heads; one English speaking and one French speaking?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore there is no necessity for translations when there are two deputy heads, one of which is familiar with both of the official languages; that is probably the reason why there is no translation there?—A. Possibly so, yes.

Q. Then take No. 8, government contracts supervision committee, is there any translation made there?—A. The answer is no.

Q. No translation there—either because they are bi-lingual, or because they do not receive letters in French?—A. I would not go that far, Mr. Pouliot; for this reason, that the letter, as you are aware, had to do with translations done by departmental translators, but not the translation of departmental correspondence, which we agreed are somewhat different from technical translations; this did not ask what letters had been translated.

Q. But these people are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works?—A. To tell the truth, I do not know what minister they fall under.

Q. But their translations can be made by the department to which they belong?—A. Yes, all of you are referring to the translation of correspondence, it might of course be done by a bi-lingual stenographer, and that is the procedure followed in a great deal of correspondence.

Q. And the answer of Mr. Beer to the effect that there is no outside translation, could be interpreted that way; that there is no translation made outside of the department to which they belong?—A. Yes, I should think so.

Q. Let us take letter No. 2, the Archives. Is there some outside translation done there?—A. The answer of the Deputy Minister of Public Archives is, "No translations were made outside of the government service for this department."

By the Chairman:

Q. Outside of the government service?—A. Yes. Three questions are asked: what translation is done in your own department by your own translators; 2, what translation is done outside of your department in the government service; and 3, what translation is done outside of your department and outside of the public service.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And the Deputy Minister states that there is no translations made outside of the Archives, or outside of the government service?—A. Those are the answers given, yes.

Q. To both questions the answer is nil?—A. Nil.

Q. Take the auditor general, No. 3?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please tell me, what are his answers to the question?—A. The answer of the auditor general is, in addition to the above this officer—referring to the principal translator of his department—performs secretarial and other duties for the auditor general, and makes necessary translations of the French correspondence; and in reply to the questions with regard to translation done outside—either in the government, or outside—his answer to both questions are no.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pouliot, again I do not want to be taken as curtailing the proceedings but the committee has already before it a detailed summary of all the information contained in these letters. The summary shows the translations done in any department: it shows the translations done by any other department for an originating department; and it shows the translations done outside of the government service. All the information you are now taking time in getting is before us in concrete form, and I am more than a little concerned about one feature of our work this year. We have a number of important matters to consider for civil servants in general, and classes of civil servants. I am very much afraid that at the rate at which we are going these people are going to be left without their representations being heard and dealt with by the committee. I do not want unnecessarily to curtail anything, but may I ask if you consider the possibility of not taking up the time of the committee in dealing with the witnesses in asking something that is already before the committee in complete and concrete form. I suggest it for your consideration, that is all.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, it is just because it is not in complete and concrete form that I am asking these questions of Mr. Bland. If you will look at the summary under the heading, "translations done by any department," there is not an answer there as given by Mr. Bland, but there is merely a dot; there is not the same answer on the summary as there is on the letter—a dot does not mean information.

The CHAIRMAN: Can we not cover all that in this way: Mr. Bland in this summary of the translation work, have you prepared and submitted to this committee a statement in which you have a dot or a dash, and that has been placed there instead of typewritten information; that means that no work has been done under that heading.

The WITNESS: That was what was intended, certainly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right, but I have taken the trouble to peruse carefully all this file and to compare them with the statement in an effort to understand something about it. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee on these matters, but we had a lot of trouble and a lot of work to get that information and now I wish to make it clear before the committee, in order that the committee understands the work that I have done on that. I have some questions to ask Mr. Bland in that connection, and if it is impossible to ask them I will say like Mr. Chevrier, "good bye and Godspeed."

The CHAIRMAN: I am not making any ruling, Mr. Pouliot, I am rather making the suggestion that it might be possible for us to get along with the work of the committee. We have this information summarized and tabulated, and I think we may take the results as accurate. I am merely throwing out the suggestion I have made in the interests of the civil servants whose problems we want to hear this year.

Mr. POULIOT: In due deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with your ruling that we cannot hear witnesses here. We have had to sit twice here on account of that. I do not want to make any individual reference about that. I have worked on this matter from the ground up, so much so that I have been blamed by some members on the other side of the House for not attending the sittings of the House, while I am working on this. I am only sitting on this because I had more work to do than would permit me to be present in the House. Now I want to ask the witness questions pertinent to the matter. I have taken the trouble to get this file of letters from the Clerk of the Committee and to check them against this statement, and now I would like to ask my questions and have this very competent witness give relevant answers.

The CHAIRMAN: I just want to say this: I think you are mistaken in your statement, that we lost two days' time because of a ruling of mine; as a matter of fact we went on with other matters for the full time of the committee. In the second place, I wish to make it plain that you are not being curtailed in any questions you want to ask; I have merely appealed to you on behalf of the committee, having regard to the other important matters which we have yet to consider, for you to consider if the line of questioning you are following is not unnecessary in view of the fact that every bit of the information contained in the letters which you are now going over one by one is all tabulated, and before the committee in complete and succinct form.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and what I desire to do now is to save the time of the committee, to bring out the facts as they are. I am the only member of the committee who has gone through each one of these letters, each sentence of these letters; I have checked them all, and all I want to do is to bring out the extent to which the letters differ from the general summary. I will only need to ask questions of Mr. Bland for an hour or an hour and a quarter, and then I will be through.

The CHAIRMAN: I can stand it if everybody else can.

Mr. MACINNIS: Why did you go to all the trouble you did in getting this information; did you think the committee was trying to bar you from getting the information?

Mr. POULIOT: First of all, it has taken a long time for me to get this information—I have not complained about any one here—I am too good a sport for that.

Mr. MACINNIS: That is not enough, do you suggest that any one on the committee did not wish you to get this information, or desire to prevent you from getting the information.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not wish to be personal, Mr. MacInnis, but when I asked about these different things you said it was not in order.

Mr. MACINNIS: Yes, I did have an objection.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say for the information of the committee, Mr. MacInnis, that on each day this committee was to sit I have taken the trouble to get in touch with Mr. Bland—or Mr. Bland has taken the trouble to get in touch with me—to ascertain when he would be prepared to present this completed report; and on each occasion when I found he had not sufficiently checked it to make a presentation I arranged in collaboration with the Clerk of the Committee to have other witnesses who were available taken on. No one has been delayed or injured in any way.

Mr. LAURIN: It did take some time to prepare this important report.

Mr. POULIOT: It takes as much time to check it.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Pouliot, go ahead.

Mr. POULIOT: Just as fast as I can; I do not wish to say anything unpleasant to any member of the committee, nor to you, Mr. Chairman—we are brothers sitting here with each other.

Mr. LAURIN: We can take care of ourselves.

Mr. POULIOT: I know that; but I have done this work at some personal sacrifice, and I find it is very hard when some members of the other side of the House blame me for not attending the sittings of the House when I am working on these files, as happened yesterday. If you are willing, I will proceed.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Let us take No. 6, please; the Superintendent of Bankruptcy. Will you please give us the answer to these two questions?—A. I think the answer that covers that information is this: during the period October 1 to December 18, 1932, such translations as I required were done by the translating staff of the Finance Department; is that sufficient?

Q. Yes. There was no outside translation?—A. That is the idea, I think, yes.

Q. Not outside of the bankruptcy branch, nor outside of the department?—A. Mr. Reilly does not say definitely that nothing was done outside; he says any translation he has was done in the Department of Finance, which I think answers the question.

Q. Now we will take No. 7 please; is there any translation made outside of the department or outside of the service?—A. None.

Q. Now let us take the Governor General's secretary, No. 9; the same question?—A. There is no departmental translator in the office, the work is done by myself. It is signed by Mr. Crowdy, the Assistant Secretary.

Q. No. 11, please, Indian Affairs?—A. No translations outside for the years 1932, 1933.

Q. None outside of the department, and none outside of the service?—A. Yes.

Q. All right, No. 17—Marine?

Q. Number 17, Marine?—A. The answer is None to both questions.

Q. Number 20, National Research Council?—A. Again None to both questions.

Q. National Research Council. Will you please read what is set out there in the letter.—A. Yes. The first answer is:

“There are no members of the staff of the National Research Council employed as translators. A number of members of our scientific staff can, however, read and write several languages. This is necessary in order that we may keep fully informed as to scientific progress reported in foreign scientific publications and journals in various languages. Any

translation work which they may do, however, is merely incidental to their other duties, and it is not considered that the volume of such work is sufficient to justify us in keeping any separate record thereof."

The answer to question 2 is "nil" and the answer to question 3 is "nil."

Q. Therefore, when they have a bilingual staff it is not always necessary to have translators?—A. Quite so.

Q. Number 21, National Revenue.—A. The answer is:

"That all translations have been made by departmental officials."

Q. Nothing outside the department, nor outside of the service.—A. In the division of Income Tax some translation work was done outside.

Q. But I am speaking now of Customs and Excise?—A. Excise, nothing outside.

Q. Nothing outside of the department, nor the service?—A. All translations have been made by the departmental officials.

Q. 26, King's Printer.—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please read the letter?—A. Do you want the whole thing, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. Well, how is the translation made there?—A. The answer is "none" to all three questions.

Q. No, but they do some translation work there.—A. I will read the part that pertains to the questions:

"1. A list of the translations made by your department translators in 1932 and 1933, showing (a) Number and salary of translators—None (b) Number of printed pages translated—115 pages, by competent officers of the department."

The answer to the other two questions is "none."

Q. 27, Privy Council, the same two questions?—A. None to all three.

Q. 28, Department of Public Works?—A. None to all three.

Q. 33, Soldiers' Settlement Board?—A. The answer to 2 is "none," and to three "none," with the added note:

"Simple translations required by this department have been made by bilingual member of the staff incidental to ordinary duties."

Q. 34, Trade and Commerce, excluding Bureau of Statistics?—A. To all 3, "none."

Q. Now then, take Number 32, please, the Patent and Copyright Office?—A. The answer to 1 is as follows:

"One translator who combines the functions of translator and editor of the Patent Record."

Q. And numbers 2 and 3?—A. The answer of the Commissioner of Patents to 2 and 3 is:

"I am unable to supply you with answers to questions 1, 1 (b), 2 and 3."

Q. He is unable to supply the answers?—A. That is his answer.

Q. I have passed several departments, Mr. Bland. Take the Library of Parliament, Government Contracts, Auditor General, Superintendent of Bankruptcy, Fisheries, Governor General's Secretary, the Governor General, Secretary of Indian Affairs, Marine, National Research Council, Customs and Excise, Public Printing, Privy Council, Public Works Department, Soldier Settlement Board, Trade & Commerce excluding Bureau of Statistics, you will admit that in nearly all of those branches there is technical translation?—A. In a great many of them, yes.

Q. Most of them?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. And you will please tell the committee, if those departments are self-sustaining in regard to translation work?—A. I cannot answer that Mr. Pouliot, I do not know.

Q. But according to the reports that are given by departments?—A. Well, they claim that they have no work outside, but whether or not they have done sufficient work inside I do not know. It may be that they have done a certain amount but not as much as they would like to do.

Q. But the chief of each branch has written to you saying that the translation work has been done inside the department?—A. Yes.

Q. And taking the letters from each of these branches, would you not say that they are self-sustaining in regard to translation?—A. Well no, I cannot quite agree to that. They have said that the work of translation has been done within the department, but it does not necessarily follow that they have done as much translation work as they would like to have done.

Q. That is not what I am asking you. If you take each of those letters that we have mentioned, leaving aside the Patent and Copyright Office, which gives no answer, the chief of each branch writes to you saying they have had no translations made outside of the department, nor outside of the service.—A. Yes.

Q. Which means that all the translation of the department is done within the department.—A. All the translation that has been done has been done inside, yes.

Q. That is the meaning of the letter?—A. That is it.

Q. Therefore, if we take those letters, each of those letters, it would show that each of those departments is self-sustaining with regard to translation.

The CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily.

The WITNESS: That is just the point I take. I do not quite agree on the word "self-sustaining." With the explanation I give I do, but not otherwise.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Yes, but each of those letters that you have received were sent to you under the authority of the minister concerned.—A. I presume so.

Mr. CHEVRIER: None of them have said, that they did so much work that they had to go outside.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. None of them said that?—A. I did not ask them that. I did not write the letters, as a matter of fact.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But cannot we assume, that the fact that they have not sent any work outside is that they are self-sustaining, that they had enough work to carry on with their staff.

The CHAIRMAN: It may mean, that they did not have any outside place to which they could send it with the hope of getting it done and they had to put up with it.

The WITNESS: There is one thing, I think, that should be taken into consideration in connection with it, though, Mr. Chevrier. It is quite true that the work that has been done has been done within the departments, but as we all know, in many cases, translations have been very slow in coming down due to the fact that the department has not been able to do it on account of lack of staff.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I did not ask you for your opinion, Mr. Bland.

The CHAIRMAN: That is just what you have been asking for, and you did not like it.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But your opinion is not based on the answers that you have received?—

A. I have quoted you exactly the answers of the gentlemen to whom we have written, their response to the questions that were asked them, at the instance of the committee. You asked me if my opinion is based entirely upon these answers, and I have to say No it is not.

Q. The information you have about those departments, Mr. Bland, is the information that you have in those letters?—A. Yes.

Q. And have you some additional information that is not contained in those letters about each of those departments?—A. Well, only the experience that we have had with the departments in the last ten years.

Q. Did any of these departments ask you for some more translators, and have the Civil Service Commission refused to supply them?—A. We have been asked a good many times for assistance in translation which we have found it difficult to get.

Q. That is, for departments?—A. Some of it is, yes.

Q. Which ones?—A. I cannot tell you that offhand, Mr. Pouliot, I would have to look up the record.

Q. But it was only occasionally?—A. Occasionally, yes.

Q. As a rule, those departments generally ask you for any supplementary help with regard to translation.—A. They have not in the past years as they have in the last six months. In the last six months the commission has had a great deal more to do with having to arrange for the transfer of help from one department to another, and on that account I think we have had more requests, and more information on the needs of translation than we had in the preceding period.

Q. But you cannot give us the precise number at all.—A. I cannot tell you the exact number, no.

Q. You have no other information at hand?—A. No.

Q. Then take Number 1, Agriculture. What is said about translation outside of the department?—A. The answer to Number 2 is:

About thirty or forty German or Italian letters a year are translated by Mr. VanVeen, of the Secretary of State Department, and a few Russian letters by Mr. Pearl, of the Post Office Department.

The answer to Number 3 is:—

No translation work has ever been made outside the department for over twenty-five years.

Q. Now, will you please take Number 32, Department of the Secretary of State.—A. Might I just complete this, Mr. Pouliot; this is Agriculture, and I gave you the answers to 2 and 3.

Q. No, no, it is just that.—A. Well, it is not complete, though.

The CHAIRMAN: Let him read the answer. We want to get all of it, not part of it.

Mr. POULIOT: Just a minute, I will tell you why.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not interested in "why." Let us have the answer.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you why. It is because experimental farms are included in the Agricultural Department. They were separate in the report and they are included in the letter. However, I have not the slightest objection, and I apologize for interrupting you at this moment.

The WITNESS: The answer as regards experimental farms, which is a part of the Agricultural Department, is:—

2. A list of the translations made in 1932 and 1933 and approximate number of printed pages of translation made for your department by government translators outside of your department.

Ten letters. Ten pages.

3. A list of the translations made in 1932 and 1933 and approximate number of printed pages made for your department by translators outside the government service, and cost of some to the department.

Nil.

Q. And you had the subsequent information, that these letters were translated by the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. Yes.

Q. Well now, will you please take Number 32. Department of the Secretary of State, and tell the committee how many letters were translated by the Department of the Secretary of State in each of the years 1932 and 1933 without describing the language of each letter?—A. This is from a statement of translations made by the Department of the Secretary of State, from September, 1931, to January, 1933, by Mr. VanVeen, a total number of 1,171 letters and certificates, and a total of 459 foolscap pages of technical matters and documents.

Q. No, no, just for the Department of Agriculture.—A. Oh, for the Department of Agriculture alone?

Q. Yes.—A. Forty-four letters and certificates and sixty-seven foolscap pages of technical matter and documents. That is the first year. Do you want the next year too, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. Now, according to the report of the Department of the Secretary of State, regarding the translation made by that department for the Department of Agriculture, from September, 1931, to January, 1933, the Department of the Secretary of State translated for the Department of Agriculture forty-four letters and sixtyseven foolscap pages of technical matters and documents?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, for the year January, 1933, to January, 1934, the Department of the Secretary of State has translated for the Department of Agriculture 48 letters and 154 foolscap pages of technical matter and documents?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, that is all the matter that has been translated for the Department of Agriculture in 1932 and 1933.—A. Well, those are the replies given us, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Let us take the Department of Labour now.—A. What number is Labour, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. Fifteen.—A. The answer to Question 2 is:—

List of the translations made and approximate number of printed pages of translation made for the Department of Labour by government translators outside of the department:—

1932—One letter in Polish.

1933—One letter in Ukrainian.

One letter in German.

The answer to Number 9 is "Nil."

Q. Now then, if you take the report of the Department of the Secretary of State, what does it show for Labour?—A. Four letters and certificates. That is all, for the period September, 1931, to January, 1933; and for the subsequent period January, 1933, to January, 1934, two.

Q. Two letters?—A. Two letters and certificates.

Q. Therefore, in the two years, the only translation which has been made outside the Department of Labour were six letters which had been translated by the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. Yes, that is their answer.

Q. Number 18, Mines?—A. The answer to question 2, that is, translation done outside the department by government translators, there is a fairly long answer for 1931-1932.

Q. Will you please sum it up?—A. A total of 95 pages of text done by the Department of the Secretary of State; and for the year 1932-33, a total of 115 pages done by the same department.

Q. Will you please take the report of the Department of the Secretary of State, and see if there is any translation mentioned for the Department of Mines from September 1931 to January 1934.—A. There was none.

Q. None?—A. No.

Q. 19, Department of National Defence?—A. There was no translation made for this department during these years by government translators outside of the department, except a relatively small number of routine departmental letters. The only translator outside of the government service, employed by this department during these years, was Major Ernest Legare, of Quebec, who turned into French ten pages of "Amendments Number 3 to Infantry Section Leading," at \$1.50 a page. For this work, together with a charge for the paper used and proof reading, Major Legare was paid a total of \$18 in January, 1933.

Q. Yes. Will you please check it now with the Department of the Secretary of State and see what translation has been made by that department for the Department of National Defence?—A. For the first period, September, 1931, to January, 1933, six letters and certificates; and for the following period, January, 1933, to January, 1934, one foolscap page of letters and certificates.

Q. Seven letters in all from September, 1931?—A. Yes, seven pages.

Q. Now, let us take Number 22, Income Tax.—A. Translations made by government translators outside the Income Tax Division, total number of forms 18; total number of pages 42.

Q. That was done outside the department but inside the service?—A. Inside the service. And question Number 3, translations made by translators not in the employ of the Dominion government, total number of forms 21, and total number of pages 41, at a total cost of \$77.73.

Q. That was done outside?—A. Outside, yes.

Q. And in 1932, 18 forms and 42 pages were translated outside of the department but within the government service; and in 1933, 21 forms and 41 pages were translated outside the service?—A. Yes.

Q. At a cost of \$77 odd?—A. That is right.

Q. Besides that, there is nothing else in the Department of Income Tax that has been translated outside of the department for those last two years?—A. That is their statement.

Q. 23, Pension Commission.—A. Yes. The reply reads:—

I may say the commission does not employ a translator. French translations required by the commission consist of routine correspondence, of which no record is kept by the commission, and the commission's annual report. This work is performed by the Department of Pensions and National Health and details in respect thereto are being included in the return to be submitted by that department.

Occasional translations of letters in languages other than French are obtained from the Post Office Department and the Office of the Secretary of State.

Q. But the Pension Commission is under the jurisdiction, or has the same minister as the other branch you have mentioned.—A. The same minister, yes.

Q. Therefore, it is the same department.—A. No, it is an independent unit.

Q. The Pension Commission is a unit?—A. Yes.

Q. And there is a Department of Pensions and National Health?—A. Yes.

Q. And the minister has jurisdiction over both?—A. Both, yes.

Q. Will you please look at the Department of the Secretary of State report and see if there is anything for the Pension Commission?—A. I do not see the Pension Commission mentioned. They do mention the Department of Pensions though. Would you like it, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. No, we will take it in due course. Now then the Pension Commission sent some letters to the Secretary of State and to the Post Office Department. Is there a special rule governing the direction of translations to such and such a branch or to such and such a branch, or how is it done?—A. I presume in that case it would simply be an arrangement made between the Pension Commission and the other department, purely inter-departmental.

Q. But did the commission receive any request by the Pension Commission—I want you to answer that broadly—with regard to translation being directed either to the one department or the other?

Mr. PUTNAM: It depends upon the language.

The WITNESS: I have no knowledge of it, Mr. Pouliot. I do not recall any request from the Pension Commission for assistance in translation.

Q. Therefore, it is an arrangement between themselves.—A. I would imagine so, yes.

Q. That is your idea of the whole thing?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Putnam could give you the detail if you would like to have it.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not want to ask him any questions without the approval of the committee. How is it done, Mr. Putnam?

Mr. PUTNAM: In the Post Office Department they have a man who translates Russian, and I presume it was Russian letters they were taking to the Post Office Department, and German and other mid-European languages to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. POULIOT: But it did pass through the commission.

Mr. PUTNAM: No, never.

Mr. POULIOT: Did the commission make any suggestion in that regard?

Mr. PUTNAM: I think not.

Mr. POULIOT: It is an arrangement between themselves?

Mr. PUTNAM: Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Number 24, Department of Pensions and National Health?—A. Questions 2 and 3 are unanswered. This is what they say:

Questions 2 and 3 are unanswered as all the translation work of the department and the Canadian Pension Commission, except occasional letters in Russian, Greek, etc., are translated by departmental translators.

The occasional letters in Russian and Greek, I suppose, would be the letters which the Pension Commission refer to in their correspondence.

Q. Please take the Department of the Secretary of State report and see what translation has been made by that department for the Department of Pensions and National Health.—A. For the first period, September, 1931, to January, 1933, 6 foolscap pages of letters and certificates; and for the following period, from January, 1933, to January, 1934, 91 foolscap pages of letters and certificates, also 6 foolscap pages of technical matter and documents.

Q. Therefore, in the period September, 1931, to January, 1933, 151 foreign letters had been translated by the Department of the Secretary of State for the Department of Pensions and National Health, as well as 6 foolscap pages of technical matter?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all that appears there?—A. That is all that appears there.

Q. Therefore, Mr. Bland, in the following departments, Department of Agriculture nothing but 92 foreign letters have been translated outside of the department; Labour Department, 3 letters, according to that department; and 6 letters according to the Department of the Secretary of State are the only ones that have been translated outside of the Department of Labour. In the Mines Department, 108 pages of text, according to the report of the department, have been translated outside, and there is nothing about it in the report of the Department of the Secretary of State; and in the Department of National Defence, 6 letters have been translated by the Department of the Secretary of State, and Major Legare, of Quebec, has translated 10 pages, that is, outside the service; Income Tax Department, 18 forms and 42 pages have been translated outside the department in 1932, and in 1933, 21 forms and 41 pages outside the service; and the Pension Commission has occasional translations made by the Secretary of State and the Post Office Department; and the Department of Pensions and National Health had in 1932-1933, 151 foreign letters plus 6 pages of foolscap translation made by the Department of the Secretary of State. Besides that, in those seven departments, no translation was made outside of the department or outside of the service.—A. That is the answer given, yes.

Q. Therefore, will you tell us if that translation means an important fraction of the whole translation which is made by the departments?—A. That is, the section that was done outside the service or outside the department?

Q. No, no, the whole thing.—A. Outside the department and outside the service?—

Q. Yes, both of them together?—A. No, it is not a particularly large percentage.

Q. It is small?—A. Yes.

Q. And besides the forms of the Income Tax Department, upon which we have no information whether they were foreign, or in English or French?—A. No.

Q. And the letters which have been translated, either by the Department of the Secretary of State or the Post Office Department, for those seven departments were foreign letters?—A. A great deal of it, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, will this be a convenient time to adjourn?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is it your intention to sit this afternoon, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, at four o'clock, Mr. Chevrier. We will now adjourn to resume at four o'clock.

The committee adjourned at 1 p.m. to resume at 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The Committee resumed at 4.15 p.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding.

Mr. C. H. BLAND, Civil Service Commissioner, recalled.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You have that file of letters with you?—A. Yes, I have.

Q. We will now take the two departments that send translations to the Secretary of State—and other departments, and the R.C.M.P.—who are also referring translations to the Blue Book branch of the House of Commons. No. 4, is the Department of External Affairs. Will you please read what it said in

Mr. Skelton's letter to the Civil Service Commission about the translations made outside the department?—A. Question 2, with reference to translations made outside the department by other government translators: no translations from French into English, or English into French were made in 1932 or 1933 for our department by government translators outside of the department. In 1932 a French translation of the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway Treaty (eight pages), which would ordinarily have been done in this department, was made by the Service de la Traduction Generale (Chambres des communes) by arrangements effected through the Department of the Secretary of State. Translation of documents in foreign languages (Spanish, Italian, Russian, Polish), have been made at our request by government translators in other departments to the equivalent of about 22 printed pages in 1932, and 17 pages in 1933. None of these communications were printed.

Q. Will you please check up with the report of the Secretary of State and tell me if from September 1931 to January 1934 the Department of the Secretary of State has translated 24 foreign language letters, and 52 pages of foolscap technical?—A. 75.

Q. Pages of technical matter until January, 1932?—A. 75 altogether.

Q. 75 from September 1, 1931 to January 19, 1934?—A. Yes.

Q. And that is all that you see there?—A. That is all I see there.

Q. And the translation of the House of Commons, was eight pages?—A. Eight pages, yes.

Q. Are the figures in Dr. Skelton's report and in the report of the Secretary of State identical with regard to foreign translation?—A. 22 and 17; Dr. Skelton says 22 and 17—and the report from the department of the Secretary of State says 17 and 7. But there is this differentiation between the two, the letter from Dr. Skelton refers to the equivalent of 22 printed pages, and the report from the Secretary of State's Department refers to foolscap pages, which may explain the difference.

Q. Yes, and they run about 2½ pages to one page of foolscap—one page as mentioned by Dr. Skelton?—A. And the report of the Department of the Secretary of State includes a longer period of time than does Dr. Skelton, a few months.

Q. Yes, there may be something in that. No. 13, the Department of the Interior—the same question please?—A. I will have to read a little more, it is a longer statement.

Q. Then I will ask you the question: did the Department of Interior have in 1932, 142 pages; and in 1933, 133 pages translated by the Blue Book Branch of the House of Commons?—A. Yes.

Q. And during the same period did they have ten, and fifteen legal documents translated by the Law Branch translators of the House of Commons?—A. Yes.

Q. And do they mention that the Department of the Secretary of State during that period translated for them 55 letters and certificates, and 412 pages of technical matter?—A. The figures given in the letter of the Assistant Deputy Minister are, we estimate that some 200 letters and about 10 articles were translated by the translation offices of the Secretary of State's Department and by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Q. Will you please read the Secretary of State's report?—A. Yes.

Q. And say that during that period, or from September 1931?—A. Thirty-eight for the first period and seventeen for the second; a total of fifty-five.

Q. Fifty-five letters?—A. Fifty-five pages, and 412 pages of technical material, documents.

Q. Yes, but these pages first mentioned, fifteen pages were letters and certificates?—A. Yes.

Q. And afterwards 412 pages of technical matter?—A. Yes.

Q. And how many items did the head translator of the Department of the Interior translate in two years?—A. The Department reports that the translation work of this Department, during the years 1932 and 1933, has been mostly in the nature of departmental correspondence; and then he goes on to specify what that included—the general translation.

Q. I do not want all that. I want you to read that letter and see if somewhere in the letter it is mentioned that the head translator of the Department of the Interior has dealt with 10,000 items?—A. Yes, that is in the statement.

Q. That is included in that?—A. That is right, yes.

Q. Do you remember how many translators were in the Secretary of State's department two or three years ago?—A. I should say there were four or five; more than there are now, I should think about five altogether.

Q. Yes, and do you think that there is enough work for two men in that department now, as the head translator handles 10,000 items and sends 141 pages in 1932 and 132 pages in 1933 to the House of Commons, besides other legal documents?—A. There would seem to be more than enough work for one man if he sends that much out.

Q. Would it be unreasonable to put a man there to handle what they are doing now?—A. It would seem to need more than one, yes.

Q. Therefore, if there were two men there in the Department of Interior to handle their translation, they would not have so much to send out to the Blue Book Branch and to the Law Branch of the Translations of the House of Commons?—A. I think that is true, yes.

Q. It would relieve them surely?—A. It would reduce the amount they would have to send out.

Q. What have you on 3A, the Civil Service Commission; there was no letter sent by it?—A. Just a summary.

Q. Have you a French translator in the Civil Service Commission?—A. No.

Q. How was the translation done?—A. The technical matter, such as the reports and any special matter, is done by the House of Commons Blue Book staff; and the correspondence is done by the bilingual stenographers.

Q. On the staff of the commission?—A. Yes.

Q. And who translates the bulletins, and that kind of material—and the advertisements of competitions?—A. They are translated by the bilingual members of the staff—not translators, though.

Q. By bilingual people who are translators de facto?—A. Part time.

Q. But not by right?—A. Part-time only.

Q. And they are qualified to do that work properly?—A. Quite so.

Q. But they have not the title?—A. That is it.

Q. Then, therefore, there are many translators in the Civil Service Commission?—A. There is much work done by people who are not called translators.

Q. Yes, and is it done by many of them?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. It is not done by single men?—A. That is true.

Q. Therefore these people are translators in fact?—A. Yes.

Q. And they are qualified?—A. Yes.

Q. And the work is done there within the Commission?—A. Yes.

Q. And the only translation that is sent outside of the Commission was the annual report in 1932—twenty-two printed pages; and in 1933, twenty-six printed pages, which were translated at the House of Commons?—A. Yes.

Q. That is right?—A. I think there is something else that is not here, I think certain examination papers have been translated outside.

Q. Would it not be better, Mr. Bland, to have a translator as it was before, to look after the translation of these reports and to supervise within the Commission the translation as it was done before?—A. I think if we had a good Bureau of Translation it would be the best thing for it.

Q. How long was the translator whom you had on the staff of the Civil Service Commission, and who retired on December 1, 1932, with the Commission?—A. He had been there over twenty-three years.

Q. Since the beginning of the Commission?—A. Practically, except for the first year.

Q. And he was there all the time?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was only after he retired that the reports were sent to the House?—A. I think that is true, Mr. Pouliot; although there may have been some portion of technical work sent out, I do not think there was very much of it before that, I think he did practically everything.

Q. Yes, he had to supervise the whole thing when he was there?—A. He did not supervise the translation of correspondence, but the technical matter, yes.

Q. He had a special knowledge of these matters?—A. He was an excellent translator.

Q. But the supervision was done within the Commission?—A. Yes.

Q. It was satisfactory?—A. I think so, quite.

Q. And if the same thing was done again, it would be satisfactory, just the same?—A. If we had the same man again I think it would.

Q. He was a pretty competent man?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You say that at one time you had a translator in the Civil Service Commission and he was an expert?—A. Yes.

Q. Now then, do I understand you to say that certain examination papers have been sent out for translation outside; documents that appear in the third column there in that statement?—A. Yes.

Q. Why were these certain examination papers sent out for translation?—A. Most of them, Mr. Chevrier, were papers in other languages than English or French; some were German, Spanish, Italian, Russian, and that kind of thing; it was necessary to send some of these things outside.

Q. Then I understood you to say that if there was a good central bureau, you could send translation there; why would you prefer that to having an expert translator such as you had before, who would do that translation in your own branch; because I understand that there would be some things confidential; which could be better dealt with that way than by being sent out to a central bureau?—A. I think that even with a central bureau it may be necessary to have a few confidential things done within the branch.

Q. Am I right then in assuming that the same thing applies as applies in the desire of the Civil Service Commission to have within its own jurisdiction a printing establishment where confidential printing would be done?—A. I think the confidential section of the printing work is in the same category as the confidential section in connection with translations. As far as general printing is concerned that is done by the printing bureau.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Number 5 and Number 12, Finance and Insurance.—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please read the letter that you have received from the Deputy Minister of Finance in answer to yours.—A. Dr. Clark's letter reads as follows.

Q. What is the date of that letter?—A. April 20th, 1934:—

1. (a) One principal translator. Died April 15, 1932. Position not filled.

(b)

	1932	1933
2. Public Accounts—pages.. . . .	110	102
Estimates—pages.. . . .	99	99
Budget speech—pages.. . . .	37	38

Report of Royal Commission on Banking & Currency—pages.	119
Departmental Correspondence, documents, etc. —pieces.	925	1100
Tariff Board references.	40
Certain translations made in the House of Commons. Others in the Post Office Department.		

3. No translations made outside the government service.

Q. Yes.—A. Then the Department of Insurance.

Q. Just before you come to that, Mr. Bland, will you please summarize it by saying that according to Mr. Clark's letter, in 1932, the Blue Book Branch and the Post Office Department have translated 246 pages and 925 pieces?—A. That is correct.

Q. That is, the Department of Finance?—A. Yes.

Q. And in 1933, 348 pages and 1,100 pieces for the same department, plus 40 references for the Tariff Board?—A. That is correct.

Q. Now, take Number 25, Post Office Department. In the Deputy Minister's letter, is it mentioned that the Post Office Department has translated in the two above mentioned years, 1932 and 1933, an average of 1,300 pieces for the Department of Finance and 900 pages for the Tariff Board?—A. Yes, that is the statement.

Q. Each year?—A. That is the statement made, yes.

Q. And the Insurance Department, Number 12, has sent to the Blue Book Branch, in 1932 and 1933, an average of 14 printed pages per year?—A. Yes.

Q. And you have no report from the Farm Loan Board?—A. No.

Q. Now, was there a translator before in the Finance Department?—A. Yes.

Q. When was he superannuated, or when did he die?—A. He died April 15, 1932.

Q. Was he replaced?—A. No.

Q. Do you think that there is sufficient work for one man there, a translator, in the Finance Department, for the department, for the Tariff Board, and for the Farm Loan Board?—A. Well, there is certainly quite a volume of work, as is shown by the department report, but I would like to know just what the work was before I would say it would take a translator's entire time. However, I would say it was considerable.

Q. Sufficient to employ a man during the year?—A. Well, I should think so. As I say, however, I would not like to make a definite statement without knowing what the work was.

Q. And do you also know, that the translation of the Tariff Board references and papers are most difficult on account of their technical nature?—A. Yes, I should think so.

Q. Therefore, in the Department of Finance, it would be reasonable to replace a translator who has died in order to do the translation work of the department itself, of the Tariff Board, and of the Farm Loan Board, all coming under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance?—A. I do not know that I would care to express an opinion as to what was the best policy for the department to pursue. I think that is a matter for Dr. Clark to express himself on.

Q. Well now, those two boards are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance?—A. Yes.

Q. Did the Tariff Board recommend to send their translation to two different departments?—A. Well, I have no knowledge as to that, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Did they ask the advice of the Civil Service Commission before sending Tariff Board matters and Finance matters over to the Post Office Department, or the House of Commons?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. The commission had nothing to do with that?—A. Not as far as I know.

Q. Then let us take Number 10, Immigration. In the two years, from January, 1931, to December 31, 1932, the only translation which was made outside of the department were ten pages in 1933 on account of the translator being on holiday?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all?—A. That is what is said, yes.

Q. Beyond that, the department is self-sufficient?—A. Yes, with the same objection as this morning.

Q. Well, it was not exactly an objection, but according to the information that you have from the head of the department, the department was doing its own translation?—A. It was doing its own translation.

Q. Itself?—A. Yes, itself.

Q. And it happened only once, I think, according to the information that you have from the Chief of the department?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was sent to the Blue Book branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Then take Numbers 29 and 30 at the same time, the Board of Railway Commissioners and the Department of Railways and Canals.—A. Yes, the Board of Railway Commissioners and Railways and Canals.

Q. The Board of Railway Commissioners first. In 1931 did the Board send a report of 131 printed pages to the Blue Book branch?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. And, in 1932, the same annual report, 72 printed pages?—A. Yes.

Q. And there is no information about 1933?—A. No.

Q. And the translation was sent to the Blue Book branch?—A. Well, the letter shows it was handed over to Dr. Beauchesne, but I presume it was done by the Blue Book branch.

Q. Number 30, Railways and Canals. In 1932, there were two reports covering 212 printed pages, sent to the Blue Book branch?—A. In 1932, 98 pages, and in 1933, 92 pages, and also the report of the Royal Commission, 114 pages.

Q. Yes.—A. Three in all.

Q. Yes, which make a total of 304 pages?—A. Yes.

Q. Which were sent, in 1932 and 1933, to the Blue Book branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, sir, previously there were two translators in the Department of Railways and Canals?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Board of Railway Commissioners come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways and Canals?—A. Yes.

Q. And how many translators are there now?—A. Well, the explanation given is that one of the two was transferred to the staff of the controller of the treasury, which was formerly the accounting section of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Q. And there were two translators also in the Board of Railway Commissioners, and there is only one left?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Therefore, in the Department of Railways and Canals, and in the Board of Railway Commissioners, there were previously four translators, and there are only two left now.—A. I think it might be more correct to say that there are three, Mr. Pouliot, for this reason: That the third man who was transferred to the controller of the treasury is still doing the accounting work of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Q. Yes, but this business is a new one.—A. Yes.

Q. That did not exist before, therefore, additional work is given to the translator.—A. I would not say that it was additional work. The work existed before but under a different head. It formerly existed under the Department of Railways and Canals but it was transferred to the Finance Department.

Q. Yes.—A. Certainly the translators were reduced by one.

Q. It was the control of the auditing system of the Canadian National Railways especially that caused that transfer.—A. Oh, I hardly think so, not

the transfer of this particular official. I may be wrong, but my recollection is that the transfer of this official was due to the transfer of the accounting branches to the Department of Finance in 1931.

Q. Yes, but is the translator now under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Railways and Canals?—A. The Minister of Finance.

Q. Therefore, if the translator is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Railways has no control over him.—A. Well, his services are still given to the Department of Railways and Canals, though his actual jurisdiction lies in the hands of the Minister of Finance. That may sound rather involved, but that is as fairly as I can put it.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is that good business?—A. I think you should ask the departments concerned, Mr. Chevrier.

Q. As a matter of fact, as one who is charged with the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act, and the good functioning of the Act, do you think it is good business, in the matter of jurisdiction?—A. I will answer it this way: I think the co-ordination of the accounting services has had some good results.

Q. But in this particular case?—A. I do not know anything about this particular case to give you an answer.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The fact is this, that before there were four translators, but now in the Board of Railway Commissioners and in the Department of Railways and Canals there are only two; that is, there were two in the Board of Railway Commissioners and two in the Department of Railways and Canals?—A. Yes.

Q. And now there are three translators?—A. Yes.

Q. One in the Department of Railways and Canals, one in the Board of Railway Commissioners, and one under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance?—A. That is correct.

Q. The latter with additional work to carry on with.—A. I do not know as to that.

Q. You cannot tell if before that, the work which was sent to the Blue Book branch was done within the jurisdiction of the Board?—A. I do not know.

Q. If there was another translator added, either to the department or to the Board of Railway Commissioners, would it be necessary to send that matter to the Blue Book branch?—A. I should not think so.

Q. You do not think so?—A. I should not think so, no.

Q. Then let us take Number 34, Trade and Commerce, Statistics Branch?—A. Yes.

Q. That branch is doing a lot of work, as Mr. Chaput told us the other day?—A. Yes.

Q. But on the other hand they sent 50 pages of translation to the Blue Book branch in 1932?—A. Yes.

Q. That is only occasionally?—A. It is only mentioned once in 1932, one particular introduction.

Q. And the other translation, which is mentioned by Mr. Chaput, is translation made for other branches of the Department of Trade and Commerce, in the absence of Mr. Letellier who was in charge?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all?—A. Yes.

Q. Then number 14, Department of Justice?—A. Yes.

Q. No translator there?—A. No translator.

Q. In 1932 and 1933, there were three reports sent by the Superintendent of Penitentiaries?—A. Yes.

Q. To the Blue Book branch?—A. Yes.

Q. The number of pages is not mentioned there?—A. No.

Q. And on the first page of his letter Mr. Edwards refers to letters from convicts?—A. Yes.

Q. Written in foreign languages?—A. Yes.

Q. And sent to the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes.

Q. And partially by outside translators, that is, the translations are made partially by officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and partially by outside translators?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What does "outside" mean?—A. Outside the service I should imagine, Mr. Chevrier.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Well, take the Department of the Secretary of State, please. The only translation which has been made for the Department of Justice by the Department of the Secretary of State was in the year 1933?—A. Yes.

Q. Fourteen letters?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all?—A. That is all.

Q. And the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has the rank of a deputy minister?—A. Yes.

Q. Just the same as Mr. Edwards, but he comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice?—A. Yes.

Q. The same minister that Mr. Edwards comes under?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, to sum up, the translation made by the House of Commons, and occasionally by the Post Office Department for the Department of Finance, before there was a vacancy in the position of head translator in the Civil Service Commission the service was not sending any translation to the Blue Book branch?—A. Not very much anyway. I cannot say there was none sent. I think perhaps when there was a great pressure of work some might have been sent.

Q. And now there is no supervision made over translation in the branch on account of the superannuation of that man?—A. No supervision made of the translation of correspondence which is the only translation done in the commission, the other being done outside in the Blue Book branch.

Q. I know, but the commission has no one to supervise the translation within the commission?—A. No.

Q. As it was before?—A. No. It is done by several employees instead of having it supervised by one.

Q. Then take Number 4, External Affairs. They sent only 47 pages to the House of Commons, that is all?—A. Yes.

Q. Which is very little, and as well the translation was foreign matter. And the Department of Interior has had a lot of translation sent to the Blue Book branch which would justify the appointment of another translator there?—A. Yes, there is a lot of extra translation done outside of the Department of the Interior.

Q. And it is highly technical or difficult?—A. Well, I do not know that it would be classed as technical as some other department.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Have you got Mines in that department?—A. No.

Q. You do not have the Mines in with the Interior?—A. No, but I would include Mines as strictly technical. Some of the other probably is technical, but there would be a good deal of it that would not be technical.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But there is enough work there for two?—A. Certainly there was enough of it sent out.

Q. In the Finance Department, with the figures that you have just given, there is certainly room for one translator who would take care of the Tariff Board and the Farm Loan Board?—A. Yes, there is a lot of work there too.

Q. The Tariff Board, Farm Loan Board, and Insurance, the whole thing?—A. Yes.

Q. Immigration, 10 pages in one year, which does not amount to much, and in view of what was said this morning I might submit that this department is rather self sustaining.—A. Which one is that?

Q. Immigration, Number 10.—A. Well, they have done their own work practically altogether.

Q. And in the Board of Railway Commissioners and in the Department of Railways and Canals, if there was one more translator no work would be sent to the Blue Book branch, and that additional man would have lots to do?—A. He would have lots to do, yes.

Q. In the Department of Trade and Commerce, notwithstanding the fact that they have sent 50 pages to the Blue Book Branch in 1932, we might say that it is a self-sustaining branch because they do an awful amount of work?—A. A great deal.

Q. And the Department of Justice is self-sustaining also?—A. Yes.

Q. With the exception of the Superintendent of Penitentiaries?—A. Yes.

Q. And letters from convicts?—A. Yes.

Q. That concludes this part of it, and now I will take departments which make translations for others. Take the Post Office Department, Number 25. Will you please read the letter that you received from Mr. Coolican?—A. This is a letter from Mr. Coolican, dated April 17th, 1934, and I imagine it is the last paragraph in which you are interested, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. Well, I would like to see the work that is done there.—A. You refer to work done by the Post Office Department for other departments?

Q. Yes.—A. This is what he says:—

It is assumed that particulars of the work done by the translators in this department for the Finance Department and for the Tariff Board since September, 1933, will be included in the statements furnished from the two sources named. I might say, however, that the work done for the Finance Department so far is at the rate of 1,300 pieces per year, and for the Tariff Board at the rate of 900 pages per year.

Q. Yes. Is there a translator there named Mr. Pearl who does some foreign work for that department?—A. Yes.

Q. He is familiar with the Russian language?—A. I believe so.

Q. Before dealing with the Department of the Secretary of State and the R.C.M.P., will you please take the document which has been tabled by you, and which was prepared in the middle of April, showing the units and the number of translators?—A. Yes.

Q. The disposition is a little different, but I understand that all the branches of the service are included therein.—A. I think so.

Q. Agriculture, seven translators?—A. Seven translators.

Q. Rather self-sustaining except for a few foreign letters, you remember that? I just want you to summarize it.—A. Do you want me to check each one, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. I just want you to summarize it, Mr. Bland.—A. That is my recollection.

Q. It is just to have it on file?—A. Exactly. I think that is correct.

Q. Archives, self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Audit Office the same thing?—A. Yes.

Q. Biological Board, under what department is that?—A. Minister of Marine.

Q. There are no translators in the Biological Board, but the translation must be made by the translator of the Department of Marine, or presumably so?—A. I think so, yes.

Q. And the Department of Marine is self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Canadian Pension Commission?—A. Yes.

Q. There is occasionally some foreign correspondence and the translation is made by the Department of Pensions?—A. Yes.

Q. Although it appears that there are no translators there apparently?—A. None classified as translators.

Q. But there are people who do the work?—A. Yes.

Q. The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission. Did you have a report from the commission on translation?—A. Excuse me for going back a moment, Mr. Pouliot. In the Department of Pensions, did I understand you to say that there were no translators there?

Q. No, the Canadian Pension Commission.—A. The work done by the Department of Pensions.

Q. Yes?—A. In the Department of Pensions.

Q. Oh, yes, there are translators there.—A. Yes.

Q. I mean in the Pension Commission there are no translators under such a head?—A. That is correct, yes.

Q. And I believe there has been occasionally foreign translation, and the other translation is made by the Department of Pensions?—A. Yes.

Q. Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission?—A. Yes.

Q. No report?—A. A verbal report. They have no official translator. I think they do all their own work themselves.

Q. And you know that one of the commissioners is Mr. Maher?—A. Yes.

Q. Who is a French bilingual man?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Landry, the secretary, is a bilingual man?—A. Yes.

Q. They do their own translation?—A. Yes.

Q. And they have not sent anything outside?—A. Not so far as I know.

Q. The Chief Electoral Officer, there is apparently no translator there?—A. No.

Q. But Mr. Castonguay is bilingual?—A. Yes.

Q. And he has a bilingual staff?—A. I presume that some members are.

Q. There is no one on the staff given the title of translator, but they all can translate, I presume?—A. Yes.

Q. And in the Civil Service Commission there has always been a bilingual man amongst the commissioners?—A. Yes.

Q. And there are many bilingual people on the staff, as you have said?—A. Many.

Q. But apparently there are no translators there?—A. No.

Q. They are de facto but they have not got the title?—A. Yes.

Q. In the Exchequer Court there are two judges?—A. Yes.

Q. One of whom, at least, is bilingual?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Justice Audette, who was there for a great many years, was bilingual?—A. Yes.

Q. And so is his successor, Mr. Justice Auger?—A. Yes.

Q. And they must have some bilingual people on their staff?—A. Yes.

Q. However, there are no translators with the title of translator, but the translation is made just the same?—A. Yes.

Q. And do you also know, Mr. Bland, that the judgments given in French by the justices of the Exchequer Court are published in French in the Supreme Court of Reports?—A. I did not know that, no.

Mr. POULIOT: I am quite sure the Chairman will agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree with that.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And the Department of External Affairs one translator, practically self-sufficient, except for a few pages which has been sent to the House of Commons, and foreign?—A. Yes.

Q. Then there is insurance, the Farm Loan Board, the Finance Department; and further down the Insurance Department. There is no translator there except the person who is working on the audit translations for railways?—A. In the Insurance Department, or the Finance—which?

Q. Finance?—A. Yes.

Q. That includes the Farm Loan Board, no translator?—A. No, the Finance as you say—just the one working there.

Q. The Farm Loan Board translation probably is sent—you have no information about that?—A. I should imagine it would be very little.

Q. Did you write to the Farm Loan Board also?—A. Yes.

Q. And you received no answer?—A. No answer.

Q. It is all done through the Finance Department?—A. Yes.

Q. And they have no foreign correspondence, just English and French?—A. Yes.

Q. In fact, although there has been a person transferred to the Comptroller of the Treasury, there is no translator for the Department of Finance?—A. No.

Q. And they are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance, as you say?—A. That is correct.

Q. It is quite an anomaly, Mr. Bland?—A. It certainly cannot be called uniform practice.

Q. If a translator was appointed to be in the Finance Department to deal with the farm loan board, the finance, and insurance matters, and the tariff board; that might be tried to see if one man could not handle the whole thing?—A. Yes.

Q. Fisheries, one translator, self-sustaining department?—A. Yes.

Q. Government contracts supervision committee, no translation?—A. Yes.

Q. Governor General's secretary's office, self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. And the House of Commons, which is self-sustaining?—A. Quite.

Q. It is working for many departments?—A. Yes.

Q. Immigration colonization, and the Soldiers' Settlement Board of Canada; the Soldiers' Settlement Board is self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. And immigration colonization sent only ten pages to the Blue Book staff in 1933, so they are self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Indian Affairs is self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Interior—there would be room for one more man?—A. Yes, most of their work is sent out.

Q. If they have the same work?—A. Yes.

Q. The International Joint Commission discusses international matters with the United States exclusively?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, everything must be discussed in English?—A. I should not think there would be much translation there.

Q. Because the French language is not an official language in the United States, and they have to deal in English with the Americans; and for some time the Hon. Mr. Casgrain and a compatriot served with Mr. Meighen; bilingual people were on the staff. I will not insist on that, but it is all right. Now the Justice Department, there are no translators there?—A. No.

Q. And two years ago there was Mr. Renaud, who died?—A. Yes.

Q. He was the Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of the French work, and now there is Mr. Fontaine, one of the important officers of the department who looks over the French part of the work of the Department of Justice, and that is probably the reason why they have no translator?—A. Possibly so, yes.

Q. Then the Department of Labour, is it not self-sustaining—that department also has work that is sent outside, but it is only a few letters they send to the Secretary of State's office?—A. Yes.

Q. The Library of Parliament—the same thing, there are two heads?—A. Yes.

Q. One of them is bilingual, which explains why there is no translation, because when a letter is sent in French it is answered in French. The Department of Marine is self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. I do not know if I have mentioned it, but in the Civil Service Commission there has always been a bilingual commissioner?—A. Yes.

Q. Mines—there are three translators, and the only exterior translation is foreign?—A. Yes.

Q. National Defence—some foreign correspondence, and a little outside work done by—outside of National Defence, the Mines are self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. And the National Research Council work is done by the staff—self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. It appears there are no translators there?—A. Yes.

Q. And the people that do the work are not paid because they do some work on the translations, and do not receive the same salary because they have not the title; is not that the case?—A. I do not know the salaries paid these people. The report states that, incidentally technical translations are made by scientific members of the staff. I should think if they are made by the scientific members of the staff, they would be fairly well paid.

Q. Evidently these people must be bilingual?—A. Perhaps polyglots, as Mr. Chevrier says.

Q. That is all right, too. The National Revenue Department, Customs and Excise—self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Three translators?—A. Yes.

Q. National Revenue, Income Tax; apparently no translators—it is not mentioned here but I have added it, because we have received separate answers?—A. Yes.

Q. The work is done by the staff, except some of the work which has been done in 1932 by the House of Commons and some outside work, which was done at a cost of \$70 last year?—A. That is right.

Q. Patent Copyright office—will you let me see that one, please, No. 32?—A. That has gone.

Q. You gave that answer this morning?—A. Yes, I think the answer was that it kept no records, wasn't it?

Q. I do not remember exactly?—A. I am informed that the Patent Copyright Office have not been keeping records on that.

Q. Pension Appeal Court, no translators—practically all the work is done in English?—A. Yes.

Q. And because the work is done by the lawyers who appear before the appeal board?—A. Yes. As a matter of fact the staff of the Pension Appeal Court is furnished by the Department of Pensions, so that the translation work would be supplied in the same way.

Q. Are they bilingual people on the Pension Appeal Board?—A. Yes, there is one bilingual member.

Q. Who could handle some of the correspondence?—A. Yes.

Q. And the other correspondence could be translated by the Department of Pensions?—A. Yes.

Q. Pensions and National Health, three translators—no outside work except foreign?—A. That is right.

Q. Post Office—well, the Department does its own work and does work for other departments, and has some foreign letters translated outside?—A. Yes.

Q. But within the service?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Privy Council—self sustaining?—A. Yes.

Q. Public Printing and Stationery—apparently no translators for the work is done by the staff?—A. Yes.

Q. Public Works is self sustaining, entirely, with three translators?—A. Yes.

Q. Railway Commission—one translator, but some work sent to the Blue Book Branch?—A. Yes.

Q. Railways and Canals—the same thing?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—we will come to that. The Secretary of State also. The Solicitor General, apparently no translators; but the Minister is bilingual and he has a bilingual private secretary, and a bilingual staff?—A. Yes.

Q. The Supreme Court—there are the Hon. Mr. Justices Rinfret and Cannon, who are bilingual?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Gobeil, the Librarian, is bilingual also?—A. Yes.

Q. And when they render judgments in French they are published in French in the Supreme Court reports, which is the same thing as for the Exchequer Court?—A. Yes.

Q. And Mr. Grenier, the reporter, is bilingual?—A. Yes.

Q. The tariff board has its work done outside?—A. Yes.

Q. They have no translators, the work is done outside?—A. Yes.

Q. The Trade and Commerce work is done within?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, that is the same?—A. Yes.

Q. Now let us take the other departments?—A. Mr. Pouliot, would you like to have those returned, they have gone up with the reporter?

Q. No, thank you; that is all right. Up to this point we have noticed that there are two departments, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Income Tax, which have sent translations outside of the service?—A. Yes.

Q. These two departments have correspondence and documents which are highly confidential?—A. Yes.

Q. And does the commission approve of that in principle, the amount is small, but it is just a matter of principle—sending the translation outside the government service for these two departments?—A. I would have to ask that that be answered by the departments themselves.

Q. Would the commission recommend such a course?—A. I would want to know what the grounds for the recommendation would be first, before expressing any opinion on it; I do not know the facts.

Q. We will just take the Secretary of State now. Will you please read the letter you have received from Mr. Coleman?—A. This letter from Mr. Coleman, the Under-Secretary of State, is dated April 18, 1934, and it reads:—

“With reference to the circular letter mentioned. I am enclosing a statement of translations made by Mr. J. P. D. VanVeen from September, 1931, to January, 1933, and from January, 1933, to January, 1934.

I am also enclosing a letter from the Commissioner of Patents relating to the work of the translator of the Patent Office.

Answering the questions set out in the circular letter:—

1. (a) 2 translators, one in the Department of the Secretary of State and one in the Patent Office, each of whom has a salary of \$3,000 a year less the statutory deduction of 10 per cent.

(b) See statement and letter attached.

2. This information is not on file in the department.

Q. And the work of the translator in the Patents Office is entirely different from the work that is done by Mr. vanVeen?—A. I should think so.
A. No.

Q. And this work of the translator in the Patents Office is entirely different from the work that is done by Mr. VanVeen?—A. I should think so.

Q. And in the Patent Office there is enough work to keep a man busy all the time without giving him an opportunity to help Mr. VanVeen in the other work of the Department?—A. I think perhaps Mr. Coleman might answer that.

Q. According to the statement you have received will you please tell me how many letters the Department of the Secretary of State has received, from September, 1931, to January of 1933 from each department. I do not wish you to read all the statement, just the total—A. Agriculture 44, Civil Service Commission 7, External Affairs 17, Finance 5, House of Commons 1, Immigration 186, Insurance 6, Interior 38, Labour 4, Marine and Fisheries 5, National Defence 6, National Revenue 31, Patent Office 1, Pensions and Health 60, Post Office 69, Prime Minister's 15, Printing Bureau 5, Rivers and Canals 1, R.C.M.P. 559, Secretary of State 106, Trade and Commerce 6; a total of 1,171.

Q. Will you please read also the total of the translations of technical matter and documents in foolscap pages for the departments?—A. Agriculture 67, External Affairs 52, Finance 5, Interior 307, Marine and Fisheries 6, National Revenue 15, and Post Office 7, a total of 459. That is the first period, do you want the second period?

Q. No, just a minute. There was a small amount of pages—about 50 odd which were translated into foreign languages?—A. 61 pages.

Q. According to the statement?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please give us the same information with regard to the translations made by the department of the Secretary of State from January, 1933, to January, 1934?—A. Agriculture 48, Civil Service Commission 3, External Affairs 7, Finance 2, Immigration 171, Insurance 2, Interior 17, Justice 14, Labour 2, Marine 16, National Defence 1, National Revenue 40, Patent Office 2, Pensions 91, Post Office 25, Prime Minister's 18, Printing Bureau 2, Public Works 2, R.C.M.P. 662, Secretary of State 66, Supreme Court 2, and Trade and Commerce 15; a total of 1,208.

Q. And below that?—A. Technical matter and documents: Agriculture 154, External Affairs 23, Interior 105, Marine 5, Pensions 6, Post Office 9, Trade and Commerce 6; total 308.

Q. Excuse me just a minute, please?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the work done by the Department of the Secretary of State from September, 1931, to January, 1933, in translation matters for the Department itself, with regard to letters, was less than one-tenth of the translations which were made?—A. Yes.

Q. 106 out of a total of 1,171?—A. Yes

Q. And in that year, no technical matter or documents apparently were translated by the Department of the Secretary of State for the Department itself?—A. Yes.

Q. And the only translation which was made in French was 16 letters: 12 for the Department of the Secretary of State, and four documents for the Department of the Interior?—A. Yes.

Q. Which were translated apparently from French into English?—A. Yes.

Q. But there is no detail about that; and besides that, nothing else was done for the Department itself in that year by that man. And in last year, from January 1st to December 31, 1933, that branch translated only 66 letters for the Department of the Secretary of State, out of a total of 1,208?—A. That is right.

Q. And those figures show that the work done by the department for the department itself was about one-eighteenth of the amount of that kind of work done?—A. Yes.

Q. All the rest was done for other departments?—A. Yes.

Q. And no technical translation has been made besides that for the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. No.

Q. Therefore, that branch of the Department of the Secretary of State is like a clearing branch for the Foreign Translations for 20 odd departments?—

A. And eleven languages.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Anyway, there were some 20 odd departments?—A. Yes.

Q. Yes, for foreign language translations; and in these two years and a few months that branch of the Department of Secretary of State has translated 559 letters, plus 662 letters by the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes.

Q. But no technical translations?—A. No technical translations.

Q. For the R.C.M.P.?—A. No.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now we will have the R.C.M.P.

Q. You have the report there?—A. Yes, R.C.M.P.

Q. You have received a letter from Mr. Spalding, dated April 18, 1934?—

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Giving you some information with regard to translation?—A. Yes.

Q. This is evidently another clearing house for translation?—A. Yes.

Q. And the translation which is made there is mostly foreign?—A. I think so, yes.

Q. A good deal more of French though in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police than there is in the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. Yes.

Q. There are two translators there?—A. Yes.

Q. And before coming to it, there is only one translator in the Translation Branch of the Department of the Secretary of State—Mr. VanVeen?—A. Yes.

Q. And how many translators are there in the R.C.M.P.?—A. Two.

Q. Will you please give their names?—A. Mr. M. H. Arnoni and Miss M. Babuka.

Q. And there is another lady there—Miss Spevek. Mr. Putnam told me that yesterday.

MR. PUTNAM: Yes, she is a stenographer.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But she knows several languages and she has to help the translators in their work. How many letters did Miss Babuka translate during the last two years?—A. 3,452.

Q. Documents, etc., for the C.I.B. What is that?—A. Criminal Investigation Branch, I presume.

Q. And will you please tell the committee what other translation work has been done by that branch?—A. In reply to question 2:

780 letters, documents, etc., were translated by government translators outside this department, during the above period.

Q. Will you please check it with the report of the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. Mr. VanVeen's report is considerably higher than the other. Mr. VanVeen has 662 in the first period and 559 in the second period, and the report from the R.C.M.P. refers to 780.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. There is no date mentioned on this second question, translations by other departments, 780 letters translated by the Secretary of State Department; there is no date as to that?—A. It says, "during the above period," which in the above paragraph specifies the years 1932 and 1933, Mr. Chevrier. There would be that surplus period in Mr. VanVeen's report, from September, 1931, to December, 1931.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And will you please tell the committee if some outside translation has been made for the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes, 921 letters, documents, etc., and 485 books, papers and pamphlets.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And what was the cost of that?—A. \$1,677.50.

Q. Of which there was some \$228 in Ottawa, \$1,250 in Toronto, and something like \$200 in Winnipeg?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Will you please take Mr. Arnoni's file?—A. I have not got it, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. If you have not got it perhaps you can refresh your memory. Did you receive several letters from General MacBrien, the head of the R.C.M.P., to the effect that the work of the translators, especially Arnoni and Miss Babuka, was highly confidential?—A. I do not remember the case of Miss Babuka, but I remember a letter from General MacBrien with reference to the employment of Mr. Arnoni.

Q. And he did say that, that his work was highly confidential?—A. I am not sure, but I think the words "confidential nature" were used.

Q. And if he used them he meant it?—A. Certainly.

Q. Therefore, this is the third department—the Department of National Defence, the Excise Tax Department and now the R.C.M.P.—which is supposed to have confidential work translated, and that work is sent outside by those three branches. That is the case, is it not?—A. I think the commissioner could answer that a good deal better than I can, Mr. Pouliot. I do not know the nature of the work that is sent out.

Q. But those three departments are departments that have translation that is of a confidential nature?—A. Yes, I should think so.

Q. And they are the only three departments who send translation work outside of the service?—A. Yes.

Q. Did the commission have anything to do with the selection of those people there mentioned in Mr. Spalding's report?—A. The commission was asked to certify the temporary employment of Mr. Arnoni.

Q. It is still temporary?—A. Yes, it is still temporary.

Q. And is Miss Babuka permanent or temporary?—A. Temporary I think, although I do not remember Miss Babuka's file at all.

Q. Well now, take the page before last of the report that you have now.—
A. Yes.

Q. And in Ottawa there is H. Levendel who has received \$217.95?—A. Yes.

Q. For Roumanian and Hungarian translation?—A. Yes.

Q. Did the Civil Service Commission have anything to do with it?—A. No.

Q. And H. Hamilton translated some Chinese for \$11. Did the commission have anything to do with that?—A. I do not think the commission, as far as I know, has had anything to do with any of the persons engaged.

Q. It has not been done with the approval of the commission?—A. It has not been referred to the commission at all, as far as I know.

Q. Then let us go to Toronto. There is a man named A. Zivian?—A. The same remarks apply to all the persons named on that page.

Q. A. Zivian, Toronto, Jewish, \$50 per month; he received \$1,200. Did the R.C.M.P. refer that case to the commission?—A. No.

Q. E. Gronberg, Swedish and Finnish, 4 months, \$57.55. The commission had nothing to do with that?—A. No.

Q. We will go further, we will go to Winnipeg. Mrs. Welton, Finnish; Mr. Heinonen, Finnish; Miss Heller, Lithuanian, and Mr. Bice, Lithuanian, 25 cents per letter, \$191. Did the commission have anything to do with those people?—A. No. I might explain, Mr. Pouliot, those people as far as I know were all taken on by the R.C.M.P. under the provisions of the Act, which enables them to take on certain employees without reference to the Civil Service Act.

Q. And under the responsibility of the commissioner?—A. Yes.

Q. And, therefore, they assume the whole responsibility for it without asking the commission for advice?—A. I do not think the commission was consulted on any of them.

Q. You do not know if A. Zivian is related to I. Zivian, Purchasing Agent of the R.C.M.P.?—A. I have no knowledge.

Q. And you do not know on what authority they have been selected?—A. No, I do not.

Q. Now, will you please read the whole page of the translations made by Mr. Arnoni, for the year 1932?—A. Record of translations made at the R.C.M.P. headquarters by M. H. Arnoni, for the year 1932:—

English, 31 letters, 7 documents, 10 pages technical work;

German, 54 books, 54 letters, 6 documents, 21 pages of newspapers;

French, 25 books, 347 letters, 41 documents, 3 pages newspapers, 21 pages technical work;

Italian, 53 books, 4 letters, 1 document, 12 newspapers;

Esperanto, 29 books, 1 newspaper;

Latin, 2 documents;

Russian, 136 books, 18 letters, 38 documents, 92 pages newspapers, 134 pages technical work;

Ukrainian, 74 books, 11 letters, 29 documents, 10 pages newspapers, 48 pages technical work.

Polish, 44 books, 8 letters, 5 documents, 19 pages newspapers.

Czechoslovak, 20 books, 12 letters, 30 pages newspapers.

Yugoslav, 4 books, 32 letters, 14 pages newspapers.

Croatian, 6 books, 17 letters, 4 pages newspapers.

Bulgarian, 16 books, 2 letters, 2 pages newspapers.

Yiddish, 18 books, 13 letters, 1 document, 8 pages newspapers.

Hebrew, 7 books, 1 letter, making a total of, including miscellaneous 58 pages newspapers, 551 books, 550 letters, 130 documents, 274 pages newspapers, and 213 pages technical work.

Q. It seems a lot of work?—A. I should think so.

Q. He must be a good man?—A. There is a footnote here, "Also help given almost daily to outside translators."

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Have you any idea what "books" refers to there?—A. Well, judging by the totals given, I would think it would be a pamphlet, Mr. Chevrier.

Q. There is no possible way of knowing?—A. Perhaps Commissioner Spalding could tell us that too.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. That is for one year?—A. That is for one year, 1932. Do you want the next, Mr. Pouliot?

Q. Oh yes, but is there any translator who can do so much as that in the service? It is unique. You see, I tell you that because we do not like to be fooled, and when we ask for information we do not like to have an exaggeration, whether it comes from the R.C.M.P. or any other branch of the service. We want to be supplied with accurate information, and when they send us information such as that, why, it is unbelievable. I would like to have General MacBrien here and tell that to him. We are not going to stand for that sort of thing from a General or anybody else.—A. I would much prefer to have General MacBrien here too, Mr. Pouliot.

Q. We are here to get at the facts, and we do not want the information padded. The man who drafted that must come from Marseilles?—A. The following is a record of translations made at the R.C.M.P. headquarters by M. H. Arnoni, for the year 1933:—

English, 2 books, 98 letters, 5 documents, 3 pages newspapers, 89 pages technical work.

German, 45 books, 18 letters, 14 documents, 12 pages newspapers.

French, 15 books, 424 letters, 23 documents, 44 pages newspapers, 8 pages technical work.

Italian, 9 books, 1 letter, 4 documents, 3 pages newspapers.

Esperanto, 10 books.

Latin, 2 documents.

Russian, 72 books, 589 letters, 13 documents, 23 pages newspapers, 9 pages technical work.

Ukrainian, 76 books, 81 letters, 4 documents, 26 pages newspapers, 5 pages technical work.

Polish, 24 books, 52 letters, 4 documents, 5 pages newspapers.

Yugoslav, 7 books, 8 letters, 3 documents, 142 pages newspapers.

Czechoslovak, 15 books, 22 letters, 6 documents.

Croatian, 9 books, 14 letters.

Bulgarian, 30 books, 3 letters, 1 page newspapers.

Yiddish, 112 books, 11 letters, 2 documents, 4 newspapers.

Hebrew, 6 books, 1 letter, making a total of 432 books, 1,322 letters, 78 documents, 253 newspapers, 111 pages technical work, and also help given almost daily to outside translators.

Q. Well, that is marvellous if it is true.—A. Well, to be fair to Mr. Arnoni, Mr. Pouliot, I presume this is a record of the work done by the two translators.

Q. No, because Miss Babuka is supposed to have translated over 3,000 letters, 3,452 letters, and I give her credit for that.—A. Then Mr. Arnoni will have to answer for this.

Q. Mr. Arnoni translated 993 books in two years?—A. Here is the information Mr. Chevrier wanted.

Q. Just a minute, sir, you are coming to the explanation of the books?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please read it?—A. Yes:—

Books.—Books ranged from volumes of 400 pages down to pamphlets of usual size. They were read and summaries made thereof in writing ranging from a few paragraphs to several pages foolscap. All imported printed matter in foreign languages must be carefully perused.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is a pamphlet?

Mr. POULIOT: There is no description given.

The WITNESS: I will read you everything that is here.

Mr. POULIOT: There is no precision in the information given there. It does not say how many books of 400 pages he has translated or summarized.

The CHAIRMAN: Surely it is obvious what he says. Mr. Bland cannot answer for him.

The WITNESS: It continues:—

Letters.—Letters, particularly those written in foreign languages are very seldom typed. They are written out frequently in an illegible hand and often highly ungrammatical. They are ordinarily very long and require considerable time to get at the meaning expressed therein.

Documents.—They are of a confidential or semi-technical nature. Often almost undecipherable.

Newspapers.—Includes paper and periodicals of which reviews have to be written and in some cases whole articles translated in full. Under this item is given the number of foolscap pages of the reviews and translations which have been made.

Technical work.—Technical works were done in a large measure for outside governmental departments. It was of a highly technical nature, such as the entomofauna, aerial photographic surveying, new chemical method of preserving museum fossils as well as purely legal matter.

English.—It means that translations have been made from the English into French or into a number of Foreign languages, particularly into Russian, Ukrainian and Polish, for the Department of Pensions, for other governmental departments and for our own branches.

Records.—Entries on a special monthly Record Sheet are made daily of every translation, under the number of the official departmental file in which a copy of every translation is kept and wherefrom the attached reports were made.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And that man, Mr. Arnoni, has failed in all the examinations in which he was a candidate, for a position in the Civil Service in 1929 and 1930; he failed in three examinations, in three competitions?—A. My recollection, Mr. Pouliot, is that he failed in an examination for the position of senior translator in the Department of Interior, and that he had passed in the special examination for this temporary work in the department of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Q. Well, Mr. Bland, I hand to you a sheet that came from the commission. Will you please read it and explain it?—A. This is the examination record of Mr. Arnoni. The first time, he applied for the position of instructor in modern languages and history, and the sheet shows that he was not successful, but that was not a written examination. I think he was eliminated because he had not been in Canada for the requisite number of years. The second position is one of Principal Translator. Mr. Arnoni did not write that examination. The third one is one for the position of Senior Translator, Department of Interior, in which he is marked unsuccessful. That is the one to which I referred.

Q. And, in 1932, did you receive any letter—without mentioning any names in particular—from a member of the House of Commons, saying that that man had lamentably failed in the examination and it was hard to understand how he could remain in the Civil Service?—A. Yes.

Q. I do not mention any names?—A. Mr. Arnoni's name was referred to at a former meeting of the committee in 1932, and the question was raised then as to his continuance in the Service, due to the fact that he had failed in the examination.

Q. And he left the department because he had failed?—A. He had failed. He would not have been continued. He actually left because the position was abolished, but he would not have been continued in any case.

Q. But, Mr. Bland, did not the commission notify the Department of Interior that Glasco was the man who was successful in the competition where Arnoni was a candidate, and that he should replace Arnoni?—A. Yes.

Q. Before the Department of Interior notified the commission that the position was abolished?—A. Quite so.

Q. Therefore, he was discharged on account of the fact that he had not passed the examination?—A. He would have been, yes.

Q. No, but that was the first step that was taken; the commission had no knowledge that the position was to be abolished?—A. No, not at the time.

Q. Is he better qualified now, or do you know?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is this gentleman now in good standing so far as the Civil Service Commission is concerned, has he passed since then?—A. Yes, he was examined for a different type of work in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, different to that which existed in the Department of Interior, and for purely temporary work of the kind he is doing in the Mounted Police he was considered qualified.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Yes, but the qualification was only on two languages, if you will remember?—A. Yes. That is to say, I do not know whether he is qualified for all those languages or not.

Q. And the commission does not know anything more than you do yourself?—A. No.

Q. And the examination was passed?—A. Yes.

Q. By a gentleman who was in the Pension Department for a time?—A. In the Soldier Settlement Board.

Q. Yes, and you asked him to translate two small portions in two languages?—A. Principally correspondence I think.

Q. Yes, in two languages?—A. Yes.

Q. And the examination was short?—A. I think so, yes.

Q. And do you remember, Mr. Bland, again relying on your memory, if the gentleman who was the examiner said that he could not verify whether his knowledge of languages was outside of the examination?—A. I do not recall that, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have no questions to ask at the moment.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there anything else that you wish to supply to the committee with reference to the Translation Bill, Mr. Bland?—A. I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Except the detail of that \$58,000.

The WITNESS: Yes, I am working on that, Mr. Chevrier, but I do not think there was anything else, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bland. I think, Mr. Pouliot, you said you wanted Mr. Coleman next.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you likely to be any length of time?

Mr. POULIOT: No there are only two or three questions that I have to put to Mr. Coleman.

Witness retired.

E. H. COLEMAN, called.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Coleman, you are Under-Secretary of State?—A. Yes.

Q. We are glad that you are there, and I take this opportunity of congratulating you.—A. Thank you.

Q. Mr. Coleman, did you ever see Mr. VanVeen's handwriting?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it the kind of handwriting that takes up much space? I am asking you that, because he mentions foolscap pages, and I would like to know if his work is done on the typewriter or in longhand?—A. I understand he frequently drafts it in longhand and then it is typewritten. I would have to make enquiry on the point.

Q. But he mentions foolscap pages. Do you know if he means a page in longhand, or a page in typewriting?—A. I would judge typewriting, but I will have to enquire on that point.

Q. You are not sure about that?—A. No.

Q. I would like to ask you how the other departments come to your department for the translation of foreign languages?—A. I have discovered that in 1931 a circular was sent to them intimating that this facility was available.

Q. Will you please read it?—A. I will endeavour to find it.

Q. It was an invitation?—A. Yes. It appears to have been based upon an Order in Council, which I fancy has been filed, dated 10th September, 1931, 2194/2188. I believe Mr. Lemaire filed that.

Q. Yes.—A. And there is a draft of a circular, which seems to have been sent to the other departments of the government, signed by Mr. Mulvey, then Under-Secretary of State, dated September 1st, 1931.

Q. Under the authority of the minister?—A. Yes:—

By direction, I have the honour to advise you that a Bureau of Translation has been established and attached to the Department of the Secretary of State. This Bureau is for the service of all departments of government without charge.

The languages in which the Bureau is at present equipped for translation are:—

Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, German, Dutch, Flemish, Italian, Spanish, Portugese.

It is understood that all departments of the government are now equipped for the translation of French.

Material for translation should be addressed to the Under-Secretary of State, Translation Bureau.

And the memorandum on the file says:—

"The same letter has been addressed to the Deputy Heads of the various departments."

Q. Which means to all branches?—A. Yes.

Q. And do you know, Mr. Coleman, if Mr. VanVeen can balance his translation every month, or if he is up to date at the end of each month with his translation?—A. I have been told—and you understand it is purely information and belief—that occasionally he may be a week behind. Some matter of urgency will come along and he may hold over something to translate in the newspapers or magazines.

Q. But is it not the case, that he is already loaded with work, and that some foreign translation is sent to Mr. Pearl of the Post Office Department?—A. I cannot say as to that, sir.

Q. I suppose that if another branch, say the Mines or the Interior, or any other branch, wants to send some translation to Mr. VanVeen, they do not send it to you, they send it to him direct?—A. You will notice that Mr. Mulvey

requested that it be addressed to the Under-Secretary of State, and nearly every morning I receive a batch of letters from one department or another.

Q. And you hand it over to Mr. VanVeen?—A. I give it to the Chief of the Correspondence Branch, and it goes through in the regular way.

Q. But besides that, Mr. Coleman, Mr. VanVeen does very little foreign translation for the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. Very little.

Q. And the main translation is done by each branch of the department?—A. You mean the translation of French into English and English into French.

Q. Yes, by bilingual people who have not the title of translator?—A. Yes.

Q. But who do the work of a translator?—A. Well, who do an amount of translating.

Q. What I mean is this, that although there is no one besides Mr. VanVeen who has the title of translator in the department, the work is done just the same in each branch of the department, and kept up to date by bilingual people?—A. The report of the department is done by the librarian, or has been during the last two years.

Q. It has been done within the department?—A. Within the department.

Q. And you are a self sustaining department?—A. So far as I am aware, in the regular routine work, dealing with correspondence, we are. Of course, I have only been there since October, and I have had no occasion—

Q. Since October you have had the opportunity to acquire quite a wide experience in the department, and according to your knowledge, there is nothing done outside, but you do a lot for other departments?—A. Yes.

Q. Only in foreign correspondence?—A. In foreign languages.

Q. But for the two official languages you are self-sustaining?—A. Yes, so far as I am aware.

Q. You are also self-sustaining for foreign languages?—A. Not altogether, Mr. Pouliot. In the Naturalization Branch they occasionally receive letters in languages with which Mr. VanVeen cannot deal, and I am informed by the chief of that branch that he sends them to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Q. In what languages, for instance?—A. I think it is in Yiddish, and in Russian, and the Slavic tongues.

Q. But that is only occasionally?—A. That is only occasionally, but no record has been made of it.

Q. But in the languages that Mr. VanVeen can translate it is done there?—A. Yes.

Q. And it is a small part of his work?—A. Apart from our own department, yes.

Q. But besides those languages you are self-sustaining?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In this memorandum of September 1, 1931, I read:—

“It is understood that all departments of the government are now equipped for the translation of French.”

I presume that that meant the Secretary of State's Department was equipped for that. Has there been any change in that?—A. Not to my knowledge, Mr. Chevrier.

Q. Your department will be equipped for the translation of French?—A. I did not write the letter.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you through with Mr. Coleman?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Coleman. We will adjourn till next Wednesday at 11 o'clock.

The committee adjourned at 6 p.m. to resume on Wednesday, 2nd May, 1934, at 11 a.m.

APPENDIX

DOCUMENT FILED BY C. H. BLAND

Unit	Number of Translators
Agriculture.. . . .	7
Archives.. . . .	2
Audit Office.. . . .	1
Biological Board.. . . .	—
Canadian Pension Commission.. . . .	—
Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission.. . . .	—
Chief Electoral Officer.. . . .	—
Civil Service Commission.. . . .	—
Exchequer Court.. . . .	—
External Affairs.. . . .	1
Farm Loan Board.. . . .	—
Finance.. . . .	1*
Fisheries.. . . .	1
Government Contracts Supervision Committee.. . . .	—
Governor General's Secretary's Office.. . . .	—
House of Commons.. . . .	30
Immigration and Colonization and Soldier Settlement of Canada.. . . .	1
Indian Affairs.. . . .	1
Insurance.. . . .	—
Interior.. . . .	1
International Joint Commission.. . . .	—
Justice.. . . .	—
Labour.. . . .	2
Library of Parliament.. . . .	—
Marine.. . . .	1
Mines.. . . .	3
National Defence.. . . .	4
National Research Council.. . . .	—
National Revenue.. . . .	3
Patent and Copyright Office.. . . .	1
Pension Appeal Court.. . . .	—
Pensions and National Health.. . . .	3
Post Office.. . . .	6
Privy Council.. . . .	1
Public Printing and Stationery.. . . .	—
Public Works.. . . .	3
Railway Commission.. . . .	1
Railways and Canals.. . . .	1
Royal Canadian Mounted Police.. . . .	2
Secretary of State.. . . .	1
Senate.. . . .	2
Solicitor General.. . . .	—
Supreme Court.. . . .	—
Tariff Board.. . . .	—
Trade and Commerce.. . . .	3

*This translator employed under Comptroller of Treasury in Railways and Canals Department.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 6

WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1934

WITNESSES:

Charles H. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner.
H. Darling, Assistant Director (C.I.B.) R.C.M.P.
P. T. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.
J. O. Patenaude, King's Printer.
J. C. Shipman, Director and Superintendent of Printing, Printing Bureau.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, April 2, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Bowman, MacInnis, Pouliot and Chevrier.

The committee again took under consideration Bill No. 4.

A letter from the Under-Secretary of State explanatory of evidence given by him at the previous meeting, was read. (See letter extended in Minutes of Evidence.)

Mr. C. H. Bland in attendance filed copy of letter of April 26, addressed to the King's Printer and reply thereto, respecting the division of the 1933-34 cost of authors' alterations. (See letter extended in to-day's Minutes of Evidence.)

The Chairman informed the meeting that he had been advised by the Clerk of the House that the Clerk of the Senate had given notice that Mr. de Montigny, an officer of the Senate, would not be permitted to attend before this committee without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. Herbert Darling, Assistant Director (C.I.B.), R.C.M.P., was called, examined and discharged.

The Clerk was instructed to request the attendance of J. O. Patenaude, King's Printer and T. P. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General, for 4 p.m. this day.

The meeting adjourned at 1 p.m. to re-convene at 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SITTING

4 p.m.

Mr. P. T. Coolican, Assistant Deputy Postmaster General was called, examined and discharged.

Mr. J. O. Patenaude, King's Printer and Mr. J. C. Shipman, Director and Superintendent of Printing, were called, examined and retired.

The committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 9th, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 2, 1934.

The Select Special Committee on Civil Service Act, met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have a quorum, and we might as well start. I have a letter here addressed to the clerk of the committee from Mr. E. H. Coleman, Under-Secretary of State. He says:—

When I was examined before the committee yesterday by Mr. J. F. Pouliot, K.C., M.P., I undertook to inquire whether the term "foolscap pages" used in the memorandum of work performed by Mr. Van Veen referred to "foolscap pages" of handwritten manuscript or to "foolscap pages" of typewritten matter.

Mr. Van Veen informs me that in the computation of pages, the reference is to pages of typewriting. When the material was not in typewritten form, the computation was based on counting two pages of handwritten manuscript as equivalent to one page of typewriting.

Then we have for this morning Mr. Darling. I think Mr. Darling was here last day.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Before we proceed with Mr. Darling, Mr. Chairman, I see that Mr. Bland, with his usual kindness and courtesy, is here. I am concerned about that \$58,000 odd of cost. Has Mr. Bland got the details of that.

Mr. BLAND: Mr. Chairman, I was going to file with the clerk of the committee a copy of the commission's letter to the King's Printer asking for the information, and a copy of the acknowledgment of the King's Printer referring to the matter. The only information that is actually submitted so far is the definite statement, that those corrections are not included in translators or authors transcript.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Now, Mr. Chairman, how soon can we have that information? I must say that I do not like this procedure. I am going to be quite frank about it. The statement has been made that \$75,000 to \$80,000 had been paid as the cost of making those corrections, and on April 25th Mr. Bland said that the cost was about \$58,000, which is indeed a considerable reduction from the figure of \$75,000 mentioned by the Secretary of State before the Senate committee. If the Secretary of State has got the details, or if the printing bureau has got the details, or if Mr. Bland has the details then I think we should have them, Mr. Chairman. I am bound that somebody is going to give me the details, I am going to get them, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Probably you had better let me read this letter, Mr. Chevrier. This is a letter dated April 28th, 1934, from Mr. Patenaude, King's Printer, to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission in answer to a letter from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission dated April 26th, 1934. Mr. Foran's letter reads as follows:—

The Special Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Service Act, which is considering the translation bill, has asked for further information with reference to the cost of making authors' alterations in 1933-34, which was estimated by the printing bureau as \$58,805.25. The

committee desires to know what portion of this amount should be attributed to alterations in English copy and what proportion to alterations in French copy. The committee also desires to know whether any item of this amount was attributable to alterations made at the instance of the printing bureau, instead of at the instance of the author.

Mr. Patenaude's reply is as follows:—

Your letter of the 26th inst. with reference to the question of the cost of authors' alterations for 1933-34, amounting to \$58,805.25, and your request that a division be made as between English and French, has been received. You will, of course appreciate that the supplying of the information would entail considerable work and considerable time as the bureau is not staffed to maintain statistics of this nature; some seventeen thousand printing jobs are involved and each job would have to be examined separately.

As to the second question, "whether any item of this amount was attributable to alterations made at the instance of the printing bureau, instead of at the instance of the author," the answer is in the negative. The following shows the cost of the different operations:—

Authors' alterations.. . . .	\$58,805 25
Composition, including bureau corrections.. . .	489,205 53

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will take that under reserve because I want to check that; but I do not see the reason why we cannot get the information that we are asking for, and if I have got to sit here till Kingdom-Come I am going to get it.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems that the reason we have not got the information you asked for, Mr. Chevrier, is because they have no staff to maintain statistical records, and it would involve the examination of seventeen thousand printing jobs in order to determine what portion of them were authors' corrections of English diction and what percentage were authors' corrections of French diction.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is perfectly all right, Mr. Chairman, but why keep on saying that it cost \$80,000 when Mr. Bland says \$58,000; why keep on repeating the \$80,000. I do not want to waive any rights I have. I will read the letter and digest it and if I want to go any further with it all right.

Mr. BLAND: Mr. Chairman, I think my first statement was that the cost of authors' alterations was \$75,000 to \$80,000 for 1932. The exact figure furnished by the printing bureau for the last year, not for the previous years, was \$58,000 odd.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The only thing I want to find out is what the cost of the alterations is with reference to the translations from French into English, and the cost of the alterations from English into French, and the cost of the alterations or corrections made in the printing bureau, because, as I understand it, everything is charged up to translation. I would also like to find out when the translation gets down to the printing bureau.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patenaude specifically states in his letter that the alterations in composition in the printing bureau are not included in the figure he gives of \$58,805.25, but they are included in the other figure which he gives, so that, in the final analysis, it seems to me your problem boils down to this: Will the committee require the printing bureau to go to the laborious task of examining seventeen thousand printing jobs in order to determine the allocation of that \$58,805.25 as between English diction and French diction.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, if this Bill means anything it means simplification and the cutting down of expenses, and if it has cost that amount of money I would like to know what the division is. We are here to investigate, we are here to find out what it costs.

The CHAIRMAN: There are some elements for consideration in the question of the establishing a bureau other than the mere question of corrections.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Be that as it may, I will get the information if I have to sit here till Doomsday.

The CHAIRMAN: Probably the rest of us will adjourn sometime.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well let us adjourn now for all the progress we are making because we are not getting any co-operation.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some explanation as to the meaning of this letter. It reads:—

Your letter of the 26th inst. with reference to the question of the cost of authors' alterations for 1933-34, amounting to \$58,805.25, and your request that a division be made as between English and French, has been received.

I wonder if all those alterations could be attributed to translation. For instance, a gentleman gives a speech in English, and another gentleman gives a speech in French. Both of them make corrections, they make corrections of their own text, therefore, there should be included in those costs only the alterations made in the text.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You are perfectly right, but that is what they will not give us.

Mr. POULIOT: Supposing, Mr. Chairman, you make a speech in English and correct it, which you have a right to do, and I make a speech in French and correct it, the amount attributable to translation corrections is only the translation that you make in French and the translation that I might make in English; it is unfair to put the authors' alterations with the translation and charge it all as translation.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think we had better leave this over now and have Mr. Patenaude come here as a witness to give us this information. I think he can do it better than anyone else.

Mr. POULIOT: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a matter of statistics; it is a matter of accounting, which is entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, it is a matter of taking seventeen thousand printing jobs, and going over them and selecting those which have been occasioned by reason of changes in translation, and segregating those from all others, and then having segregated them looking up the cost of each particular job in the segregated lot. There is no question, it is a heavy task. In the final analysis, it comes down to a question for this committee to decide whether they are going to ask the printing bureau, which is a branch of the government service, to take time to make that computation, that is all.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not care what it costs. My friend, Mr. Pouliot, is perfectly right, and he has put it very clearly. We should know if there are things being charged up to translation that should never be charged up to translation.

The CHAIRMAN: I still say it is a question for the committee to determine.

Mr. POULIOT: I admit that, Mr. Chairman, but we must have a clear sky on those matters. The other day Mr. Paradis mentioned the printing of the Bills that came to the Law Branch from Council; they are always printed. Most of their translation is typewritten and, in my humble view, the only corrections in translation which might be made are those made by bilingual members in the House when they have them, that is, when the English members translate into French or the French members translate into English, therefore, there are no authors' corrections that could be charged to the translators of the House of Commons. This comes from the evidence of Mr. Gerin. Besides

that, Mr. Paradis, the law clerk, the other day said that very often he has as many as five drafts of a Bill before it goes to the House, and it must be expensive indeed, because the pages are changed, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, if you talk for an hour are you going to change the position from what I have stated, and having stated it clearly and succinctly, the King's Printer says in order to make a computation which certain members of the committee require he has to examine seventeen thousand printing jobs, he has to segregate from them those that relate to translation, and then have the accountants find out how much they cost, and the King's Printer says that he has not a staff to do it. Therefore I say, is it not a question for this committee to determine whether we are going to ask him to do it or not.

Mr. CHEVRIER: So far as I am concerned, I want him to do it.

The CHAIRMAN: I know perfectly well what you want, Mr. Chevrier, but you are not the committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If someone will undertake to give us those costs then I will quit.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not said that myself.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is just the trouble.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just one thing more that I would like to say and it is this, that if that figure has been reached by computing authors' corrections which had nothing to do with translation then that amount should not be charged up to translation. I entirely agree with Mr. Chevrier. If the authors' corrections in translation are but few and represent only a small proportion of that \$58,000 odd, then I will not insist on that point.

The CHAIRMAN: So far as I am concerned, I cannot tell you something I do not know; and, so far as I am concerned, for my determination of the question of the establishing of the bureau or not establishing it, it is not necessary to have a segregation of the cost included in the gross sum of \$58,000 odd.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That may be quite so, Mr. Chairman, but there is no use creating an atmosphere around it, spreading rumours that are not right.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we dispose of the question?

Mr. POULIOT: What we want is a clear sky, but we are still in the clouds.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacInnis suggests, that Mr. Patenaude should be asked to come here as a witness, and this committee will be able to ascertain just what items are included in the \$58,000.

Mr. POULIOT: That would be fair.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that meet with the approval of the committee?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will be satisfied to have it divided into the three parts I mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of asking Mr. Patenaude to come here and advise us what is included in the item of \$58,000 odd.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clerk, would you ask Mr. Patenaude to see if he can come here at four o'clock this afternoon, please.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I have a different set of questions to ask Mr. Patenaude when he comes. I would like to ask him some questions in connection with his annual report, and also the booklet that is given to the members at the beginning of each session entitled "List of Reports and Returns to be made to the House of Commons." I would like Mr. Patenaude to tell the committee the time of the reception of the printed matter which he has received from each department.

The CHAIRMAN: From each department?

Mr. POULIOT: Take, for instance, the Department of Justice, or the Department of External Affairs—departmental report, treaties of peace, Bulgarian treaty of peace, treaty for suppression of smuggling operations, etc. I would not need all that, but what I would like to have is the total amount of pages which have been sent by each department during the last few years.

The CHAIRMAN: You mean, of printed matter?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, printed matter, in both languages, whether from English into French or French into English. It will simplify matters very much.

Mr. BOWMAN: I thought we had a memorandum of all that on file.

Mr. POULIOT: No.

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, the amount of translation that has been given by every department.

Mr. POULIOT: No, no, Mr. Bowman. I will tell you exactly what I mean. I do not mean the amount of translation that is done, but what I would like to know is the number of pages that were sent each time from any department to the printing bureau, during the last two years, for instance.

Mr. MacINNIS: And the number of copies sent out?

Mr. POULIOT: No, the number of printed copies is of no interest to me. It is only to ascertain the kind of cooperation there is between the various departments and the printing bureau, how it has worked out up to now, with regard to the delivery of translation. I would like to make myself very clear.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry I cannot understand what you want.

Mr. MacINNIS: You want to know at what time the reports from the various departments were given to the printing bureau for printing?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, I do not care about the distribution of the report. Say, for instance, on the 15th of April the Department of External Affairs—or any other department for that matter—has sent twenty pages of translation to the printing bureau, and then some more is sent in November, and some more in December, then we will probably see why the printing bureau is jammed at times and if there is not some way in which it can be arranged like clock work.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is what this bureau is supposed to do.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, but I would like to have the real reason.

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment, Mr. Pouliot. The subject matter you are asking for now is dealing with a matter of printing in the printing bureau, and we have no concern with that.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, Mr. Cahan has spoken about that in the House many times, and he said it was on account of the fact that people had been set back by the printing bureau, and that he wanted to have better cooperation.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not only the question of printing, it is the question of translation.

Mr. POULIOT: It is the question of the distribution of translation to the printing bureau, how it works now, and what departments are sending their translated matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Translated matter for printing?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, the number of pages, and the time.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Any report that goes down to the printing bureau is usually translated into French, or into English. As I understand it, what Mr. Pouliot wants is the amount of material from each department sent down to the printing bureau, and by that it means those things that will have to be translated.

Mr. POULIOT: The report of the King's Printer is very lengthy.

The CHAIRMAN: What you want is the dates they were sent.

Mr. POULIOT: The dates and the number of pages. To show my good will, as all the members of the committee know, the report of the King's Printer is very extensive, I will not go through that. I will ask only for a list of returns to be made.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the committee, gentlemen?

Mr. BOWMAN: I am not quite clear what Mr. Pouliot wants yet, because he has just concluded his last statement by saying only that which relates to translation. Mr. Chevrier points out that everything that goes down into English must be translated into French eventually, and what goes down in French must be translated into English.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, here is the Minister of Finance, the Federal District Commission accounts,

Mr. BOWMAN: Just what do you want, everything that goes down to the bureau, the number of pages?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, for translated matter.

Mr. BOWMAN: Everything that goes down for translation, either English into French or French into English?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. MACINNIS: What you want to know is whether it all goes down at once, in bulk?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, exactly. I would like to know the details of a report that goes down, whether it is one, twenty, fifty, or seventy-five pages, and when it went down.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me see if I understand it. Apparently the request is for the King's Printer to advise in respect of any matter sent to the printing bureau for printing, from any department, as the result of translation, the date on which it is received from each department, and the number of pages which are to be printed; and, for the guidance of the King's Printer, a list of the reports and returns to be made to the House of Commons in the year 1924 indicates the nature of the information in respect of the material required.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that meet with the approval of the committee.

(Agreed.)

Mr. MACINNIS: I would like Mr. Patenaude to bring samples of authors' corrections, and samples of work entirely corrections, and samples of work with translators corrections.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not going to agree to that at once. Who is going to make the selection?

Mr. MACINNIS: Mr. Patenaude.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is all right. It may be that there are no errors attributable to the printing bureau, and again there may be errors attributable to the printing bureau but all chargeable to translation. As I understand it, these are all charged to translation and nothing to the printing bureau. I do not think it is fair just to pick out a sample of corrections so that we will just have a certain cross-section. We should be able to appreciate what is attributable to translation either from French into English or from English into French, and what is attributable to the printing bureau. Up to the present time it is all charged to translation and the French have got to bear the odium.

Mr. BOWMAN: Surely there cannot be a lot of mistakes in the printing bureau.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You would be surprised. It is only human that those mistakes should occur. You deliver a speech, Mr. Bowman, and then it is your privilege to go over it and make certain corrections that do not involve a change in the meaning, but supposing you use the words "at once" and then you want them changed to "immediately," you have in Hansard two columns, and it may well be that by changing those words "at once" to "immediately," down at the printing bureau they might have to disturb a paragraph of ten or fifteen lines, so that you have to disturb the whole column, because they operate on the linotype, that is my objection. The moment that that type is reprinted by the printing bureau, the man who operates the machine must be paid, the paper must be paid, the labour must be paid, the machine must be paid, everything must be paid, and that all enters into the cost, and then at the printing bureau, under this cost-sheet system, they charge that all up against the cost of translation. It is not the fault of the men at the printing bureau if I choose to change one or two words in my speech. But do not charge that to the cost of translation.

Mr. MACINNIS: You have no business to change the text of your speech after it is printed. You have that privilege in Hansard to change the type-written copy, but you have no right to change the text of your speech.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You get the non-revised edition and then you get the revised edition.

Mr. MACINNIS: Quite so.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And that is where the cost comes in. For my part, I do not care about the revised edition because nobody reads it, at least very few.

Mr. MACINNIS: That is all the more reason why a member should not change the text after it has gone to the printer. I certainly never make a change in mine unless there is a word that is misprinted.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well if you do that don't you see how you throw a whole column out of gear and it is charged up to translation; it is not charged to publication.

Mr. MACINNIS: There must be considerable changes made without throwing a whole column out of gear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You might get Mr. Patenaude to bring in the corrections that are made by the members of the House of those speeches, and then you will see how much there is of it.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think it is very desirable to have those things in here to see how the members are abusing their privileges.

Mr. CHEVRIER: They are not abusing their privileges, it is the cost and it is charged up to translation.

Mr. MACINNIS: I am not concerned about how it is charged, I am concerned about a charge in any case where it should not be made.

Mr. BOWMAN: We can surely get a sufficiently general idea from Mr. Patenaude. We do not want to go into the last dollar to find out what is charged to printing or to translation. All we want to get is the general picture of the expenditure that is incurred through changes either in translation or in the printing bureau. Surely Mr. Patenaude is in a position to give us the general picture.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacInnis' suggestion is that Mr. Patenaude be requested to bring with him when he comes before the committee, fair samples of corrections attributable to translations and corrections attributable to other causes. Does that meet with the approval of the committee.

(Carried).

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything else before we proceed with Mr. Darling?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I called Mr. DeMontigny from the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. DeMontigny here? Apparently he is not available, gentlemen.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Why is he not here?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that an officer or employee of the Senate is not permitted to attend any committee without the approval of the Senate, and that the approval of the Senate can only be procured on presentation of an address through the House of Commons—Rule 94 of the Senate.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Did not we summons Mr. DeMontigny, did not we ask him to come.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, and apparently, so far as I am concerned and so far as the committee is officially concerned, the request is ignored.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Did anybody say that he could not or should not come? If so, who said that.

The CHAIRMAN: The clerk of the Senate wrote a letter to the clerk of the House of Commons calling his attention to the fact, that an officer of the Senate was not permitted to attend a committee and not amenable to subpoena of a committee of the House of Commons except with the approval of the Senate. The clerk of the House of Commons showed that letter to me yesterday while the House was in session. I looked up Rule 94 of the Senate and came to the conclusion that the stand of the clerk of the Senate was well taken.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What is that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: That an officer of the Senate is not amenable to a summons issued by a committee of the House of Commons, and that he can only be required to attend before this committee by direction of the Senate, or with the consent of the Senate.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I thought that if a motion was made in the House he would have to come. Years ago we had the same difficulty, but if the House of Commons asks an officer of the Senate to come then he must come.

The CHAIRMAN: No. If the House of Commons requests a witness to come from the Senate, and when that request is presented to the Senate and the Senate consents, then the witness is liable to come before a House of Commons committee but not otherwise.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate has decided that one of its officers should not attend this committee?

The CHAIRMAN: No, the clerk of the Senate has called the attention of the clerk of the House of Commons to the fact that this witness must not attend here without the consent of the Senate.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, that is nothing new to me because I met with that situation before, but I must congratulate the Senate upon its wisdom in safeguarding its rights and privileges in refusing one of its officers to come before this committee.

Mr. POULIOT: The Secretary of State refused to give evidence here yet he agreed to go before the Senate. I think the honourable Minister was too nice to the Senate, he should have refused to go.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not expressing my opinion. Nothing is to be gained by an expression of my opinion as to the courtesy of the Minister going to the Senate or the attitude taken by the Senate, therefore, I refrain from expressing my views. I merely state the facts.

Mr. CHEVRIER: All I can say is, that the Senate is to be congratulated. I shall have to consider what attitude I will have to take to get Mr. DeMontigny here.

Mr. MACINNIS: Ask the House of Commons to make a resolution.

HERBERT DARLING, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Your name is Darling?—A. D-a-r-l-i-n-g.

Q. And what is the first name?—A. Herbert.

Q. Superintendent, Royal Canadian Mounted Police?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Darling, do you have the letter which was sent by Mr. Spalding to the Civil Service Commission, on April 18th, about translations in the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes, I have a copy of it here.

Q. I know, but it is the same thing?—A. Yes.

Q. A copy of that very letter?—A. Of that very letter.

Q. And the enclosures also?—A. Yes, I have the enclosures as well—four.

Q. Five?—A. Yes, five.

Q. Four foolscap pages and one ordinary sheet?—A. That is right.

Q. Have you anything to do with the supervision of R.C.M.P. translation in your capacity as superintendent?—A. Yes, I have control of the volume of work done. I do not actually check the work done.

Q. You do not revise it?—A. I do not revise it. I simply record it and see that the proper channels are followed.

The CHAIRMAN: In what return is that letter included? You are referring to the letter of April 18th from Mr. Spalding to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and enclosures.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. There are three people who are in charge of the foreign translations?—A. Two people.

Q. Two?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Arnoni and Miss Babuka?—A. Yes.

Q. And a stenographer—Miss Spevak?—A. No, there is no stenographer named Miss Spevak. You mentioned Miss Spevak before, and I made enquiries and found that Miss Spevak was engaged as a stenographer originally in the Purchasing Agent's Branch. She was there for a short while during which she did purely stenographic work, nothing else. Then she was transferred temporarily to the Intelligence Branch, where she was working under the late Colonel Hamilton. His eyesight was bad and she did a lot of reading for him in addition to her stenographic work, but she did no translation work.

Q. No, but she can take dictation in foreign languages?—A. I presume she could. I cannot say that from my own knowledge.

Q. So Miss Babuka is alone with Mr. Arnoni—A. Yes.

Q. For foreign translation?—A. These two are together.

Q. Yes, and the other translation in the official languages—French and English—are done in each branch of the R.C.M.P.?—A. Yes.

Q. By the staff?—A. I did not quite get that question. You mean, French and English translations are done by other members of the staff outside the translators?

Q. No. What I am asking you is this: The work done by Mr. Arnoni and Miss Babuka is mostly foreign?—A. Mostly foreign, yes.

Q. And the translation of the two official languages is done in each branch of your department by the staff?—A. By the translators—Miss Babuka and Mr. Arnoni.

Q. Even the translation from French into English and English into French?—A. Yes.

Q. Suppose that a letter comes in, or suppose that I write a letter to any official in the R.C.M.P. in French and it is translated afterwards into English, who will do it?—A. You are referring locally.

Q. Suppose that I write in French to any official of the R.C.M.P. and that gentleman wants that letter translated into English, who would do that work?—A. Mr. Arnoni would do that.

Q. Now, the first enclosure states that Miss Babuka has translated 3,452 letters, documents, etc., for the C.I.D.—A. Yes.

Q. Is that all the work that has been done by Miss Babuka?—A. Yes, that is so, that is all the work that she has done.

Q. She has done nothing else?—A. Nothing else but that, that is, in the main. There may be the odd occasions when she might do some translation if we are particularly rushed.

Q. But you are speaking of what she does as a general rule?—A. As a general rule, that is the work that she has done.

Q. And some of those letters and documents were only of one page?—A. You refer to documents, but they are mainly letters—penitentiary letters—and they may be one, two, or three pages long, perhaps longer.

Q. Yes, which means that she has translated about 5,000 pages.—A. Yes, I suppose it would run about that; but in using the word "translation," may I say here that these letters are penitentiary letters. Miss Babuka's particular class of work is to read those letters. She does not sit down in every case and write out a written translation of every letter.

Q. She gives the meaning of the letter, the general meaning?—A. The general meaning. That is to say, if the letter is from an inmate and it is obviously dealing with personal affairs—

Q. Yes, and family affairs?—A. —and family matters, she simply confines her remarks to that, but with her knowledge of what we require, she discerns anything that should come up to the Criminal Investigation Branch, and then she immediately starts to work and gives us the detailed translation.

Q. Yes, but there is nothing of a confidential character in that except personal things concerning those inmates.—A. Except in so far as departmental matters are concerned. That is the only way you can refer to it as confidential in so far as those letters are concerned.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Who does the confidential work?—A. Mr. Arnoni.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. He alone does it?—A. Yes.

Q. Is Miss Babuka's work checked?—A. Well, it is not necessary to check it except in so far as—well, it is not possible to check it, as a matter of fact, because she is the only one that reads the letter, and, therefore, it is sent out to the Penitentiary Branch with her translation.

Q. You send it to General Ormond?—A. Yes.

Q. And those letters come to you from General Ormond and you send them back to him?—A. We send them back.

Q. And 780 letters, documents, etc., were translated by government translators outside the department during the same period?—A. That is correct.

Q. The number of foolscap pages in the report of the Secretary of State mentions 559 previous to January, 1933, and 662 afterwards?—A. Well, the only reply I can give to that, Mr. Pouliot, is from our records of letters that come in to us, and particularly those from the penitentiary authorities. The letters are numbered for the purpose of preserving continuity of the letters whilst in our possession, and to see that none go astray and that everyone is accounted for.

Q. But the number of pages mentioned by the Secretary of State is two-fifths more than what is mentioned by Mr. Arnoni.—A. By Mr. Arnoni?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In other words, are the letters there by actual count, or is it by index on the letters?—A. By the actual count of the letters, Mr. Chevrier. Each letter is given a separate number respectively, and it makes no difference whether it is a ten-page letter or a one-page letter, it just gets the number, and it is followed on all the way through.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Are those letters sent to Mr. Coleman, Under-Secretary of State, by yourself?—A. Yes, through my office.

Q. Through you?—A. Yes, through me. I would not send every letter that would come. The director might occasionally send a letter, or I would send a letter, as the case may be.

Q. According to this statement, Mr. Arnoni mentions that he is familiar with the German language, yet he has sent a considerable number of letters to the Department of the Secretary of State to be translated in German, 114 before January 1, 1933, and 235 afterwards. I will give you a copy of the report. Mr. Arnoni's reports are possibly one for 1932 and one for 1933?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, were those German letters sent to some other department because Mr. Arnoni could not translate them?—A. Without having the actual letters in question I am not able to answer that question, but I presume they would be sent over there on account of pressure of work.

Q. You do not know if they were confidential letters?—A. Not without being in possession of the documents; I would not like to say.

Q. If you will look at the report of the Department of the Secretary of State, you will see that Mr. Arnoni has sent quite a considerable number of Italian letters, 324 before January 1, 1933, and 292 in 1933?—A. Yes, that is so.

Q. Well, I would ask you the same question: Is it because he could not translate them, or was it on account of pressure of work?—A. I would say it would be on account of pressure of work rather than because he could not translate them, because he has already shown translation in the Italian language.

Q. Did the R.C.M.P. control knowledge of Mr. Arnoni's knowledge in foreign languages, and also in the official languages—French and English?—A. The R.C.M. police when they took Mr. Arnoni over, would have knowledge that he had ability to translate certain languages, and I understand that since coming to the R.C.M. police he has also made himself proficient in other languages of which he only had an elementary knowledge when he started in. He is quite a student and he is always reading up.

Q. Is it to your knowledge, Mr. Darling, that Mr. Arnoni has failed in all the examinations that he has tried in the Civil Service Commission?—A. I was not aware of that.

Q. Except one small examination that was passed by him.—A. I was not aware of that, Mr. Pouliot, until you mentioned it last week.

Q. I will show you the examination report from the Civil Service Commission dated 24/4/24.—A. Might I ask what languages those examinations cover.

Q. Probably Mr. Bland could tell us. Would you please tell us Mr. Bland what period this covers.

Mr. BLAND: It covers the period from 1929 to the present.

The WITNESS: This is the first time I have seen that, but what I want to know is, what are the languages concerned; there is nothing to indicate on that.

Mr. BLAND: The first item, Mr. Chairman, covers languages French and German; and the second item covers seven foreign languages including various types of the Slav language, German, Danish and Polish.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Is it to your knowledge, Mr. Darling, that the R.C.M.P. communicated with the Civil Service Commission in order to ascertain the qualifications of Mr. Arnoni before he was engaged by the R.C.M.P.?—A. Well, apparently Mr. Arnoni was the subject of correspondence in 1931 when the commissioner authorized his employment as a translator as and from the 27th of April, 1921. At that time he was engaged for part-time work only, and the report to us was, that he was able to translate Russian, German, Polish, Czecho-Slovakian, and Bulgarian into English or French, also a number of other Slav dialects. That was in 1931.

Q. Yes. Now, will you please tell us at what time Mr. Arnoni was first employed by the R.C.M.P.?—A. April 27th, 1931, is the correct date.

Q. April 27th, 1931?—A. Yes. He came to us from the Department of Interior on part-time work at that time.

Q. But was the R.C.M.P. notified then that he had left the Department of Interior, and if that department had been notified by the Civil Service Commission that Mr. Platzko of Winnipeg was to replace him as senior translator in that department?

The CHAIRMAN: Excuse me a moment, Mr. Pouliot. I dislike to interrupt, but has this really anything to do with the Translation Bill?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but I cannot see it.

Mr. POULIOT: All right, I will not insist on that.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now then, when did the R.C.M.P. first write to the Civil Service Commission with regard to Mr. Arnoni?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, there again the same thing applies. What has all this got to do with the Translation Bill.

Mr. POULIOT: I will tell you, Mr. Chairman; it is because he has gone into the R.C.M.P. without passing any examination.

The CHAIRMAN: What has all that got to do with the Translation Bill? Understand, Mr. Pouliot, I am not suggesting that if you want to examine into any appointment made at any time by the Civil Service Commission you have not got a perfect right to do so before this committee, you have, but at the right time. It was agreed by the committee that we would proceed with the Translation Bill to the exclusion of everything else and, therefore, I would ask that you confine your examination of this witness, and any others, to questions relating purely to the Translation Bill. And if there are any other matters you desire to examine into, I promise you ample opportunity will be given.

Mr. POULIOT: Have you any objection, Mr. Chairman, if I examine the witness on the letter, a copy of which I have given to you?

The CHAIRMAN: On anything relating to the Translation Bill, yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Let me see the first enclosure again, translators outside government service, translated, or summarized, 921 letters, documents, etc., the cost of this work being \$1,677.50. It is impossible to give the number of printed pages accurately, as no record of that nature is kept?—A. That is correct.

Q. Why and how was this translation sent outside of the R.C.M.P.?—A. We were advised that there were certain languages that could be attended to by the translation branch of the Secretary of State, and all matters that could be sent to them were furnished from the R.C.M. Police. There were others that we could not get translated there, and other arrangements had to be made. The expenditure of \$1,677.50, to which you refer, may I quote this statement showing how it is made up?

Q. Certainly?—A. It is made up by the payment of the following sums to translators: In Ottawa there was a Mr. H. Levendel, who translated Roumanian and Hungarian letters. Those were mainly penitentiary letters; the odd one would be from, say, the Post Office Department, all in connection with subversive literature. He was paid for that service the sum of 25 cents per letter, which came to the total of \$217.95. Then we had a Chinaman whose name is H. Hamilton. He also is paid 25 cents per letter. Both these men come up into my office, and examine the letters and translate them there; they are not taken out of the office, particularly so in the case of the Chinaman, because it is very hard to get him to write English as it should be written; but we pay him at the same rate of 25 cents, and he was paid for that service the sum of \$11.

Q. That is the Chinaman?—A. That is the Chinman. Now then, there are other translations required, and we send those down to Toronto to a Jewish translator there. This gentleman is conversant with the Communistic situation, and I speak of my own knowledge now, because I was at one time stationed at Toronto, and during that time he used to translate voluminously. He examines those subversive documents and was able by conversation to explain to us just exactly the trend of their meaning, which was very valuable to us at the time, more valuable than an ordinary translation would have been. His knowledge of the Communistic business was helpful. This man is paid \$50 per month, and during the period that you have, of 1932 and 1933, he was paid the sum of \$1,200, at that rate.

Q. Yes, but it was pretty hard to get him here on account of the work that was being done there in Toronto?—A. He happened to be in Toronto, and he fell right into a position that was most helpful to us at the time, and since.

Q. And, therefore, he is just the same practically speaking as any member of the R.C.M.P. would be in Toronto, he belongs to the staff?—A. He belongs to the staff inasmuch as he is a special agent or translator taken on by virtue of Section 84 of the R.C.M.P. Act.

Q. But this amount is paid to him specially for translation?—A. For translation work. But I want to be clear. This translation work is really the means of us obtaining intimate knowledge of what the articles that he translates mean.

Q. Yes, but he does not translate the whole thing, does he?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. He translates excerpts?—A. No, he translates voluminously.

Q. Suppose there is a Communistic pamphlet, does he translate it from A to Z?—A. Yes.

Q. Or just a part of it?—A. No. So that I may give you a perfectly clear picture, he would examine a subversive document and he would find that it was mainly about matters of no moment and he would say so, but in very many cases he would find that most of them were of such a nature that he would have to translate them as he did.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In Toronto he does not translate into French?—A. Hardly. Then we had a Finnish translator out there, who translated Finnish and Swedish, for four months, and the total amount paid to him was \$57.55. He became very valuable to us amongst the Finnish element, and he is now employed in that capacity.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And that is why you do not send that Swedish and Finnish to the Department of the Secretary of State?—A. That is why. That is translating work with which he is intimately connected, and on which we want reports at times. Then we have a Mrs. Welton, at Winnipeg. Mrs. Welton is paid 50 cents per letter for translating Finnish letters, and the reason that she is asked to translate Finnish letters is because the other gentleman to whom I referred would not be available on account of his duties, and it would not be wise to send penitentiary letters after him around the country.

Q. When he is not at home?—A. Yes, when he is not at home, so that we confine our penitentiary letters there to Mrs. Welton. Then there is also a Lithuanian, a Miss Heller; she translates letters for the penitentiary, at the same rate, 50 cents. I would ask, if you have that report in your possession, that you expunge that 25 cents per letter, because that was accidentally typed in there. I do not know whether that information came to you direct, but it is incorrect; they are both 50 cents, and that accounts for \$191, the whole of which totalled up comes to \$1,677.50, for the period 1932-33.

Q. Therefore, Mr. Darling, it is necessary for those people to live in Toronto and Winnipeg, the two gentlemen and the two ladies?—A. No, permit me. It is necessary for the Jewish translator and the Finnish translator to live in Toronto, but it is just an incident that the Finnish lady, Mrs. Welton, and the Lithuanian, Miss Heller, live in Winnipeg; they live there and these letters are referred to them for translation.

Q. Yes, but of those eight people there are only two who live in Toronto, that is, the Jewish translator and the Finnish translator?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Therefore, if you had a separate bureau of translation, Mr. Darling, those two gentlemen who live in Toronto would live there just the same?—A. They should live in Toronto.

Q. Whether there is a centralized bureau or not?—A. Yes. There would be no advantage in them being out of the city.

Q. Will you please explain Mr. Arnoni's statement for each year, 1932 and 1933, because they seem to be quite out of the ordinary?—A. I quite appreciate your point, Mr. Pouliot, and I think I can explain it very simply. If you will turn to page three of his remarks, you will see under the heading of books, "ranging from volumes of 400 pages down to pamphlets of usual size that were read and summaries made thereof in writing, ranging from a few paragraphs to several pages foolscap. All imported printed matter in foreign languages must be very carefully perused." In view of your expression of opinion, I wanted to be very careful as to what facts I placed before you to-day, and I went into that question, and my own opinion is, that Mr. Arnoni has endeavoured to the best of his ability to give a perfectly true and accurate record of the work performed by him. There are several features which, perhaps if I explain, will give you an opportunity of understanding what he was driving at. A book will come to us under some particular caption.

Q. A Russian book or a German book?—A. Yes, any book, in any foreign language, which he is capable of translating. It comes to us in a gaudy cover. He reads this book and he peruses it carefully, and he finds that it is a technical treatise on socialism, and he reports accordingly. Inside of a week somebody else from another part of the country will send in that same book, but now it

appears in a different guise, with a paper cover, and there are no photographs, or something else is expunged from it, or there is something added to it, which makes it necessary for him to go over that again. It is scanned through just in the same way we scan through the best sellers we buy. He has to take that course, not very frequently, but it does occur.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is most interesting. You say that does not occur very often, but it does occur?—A. It does occur. If I may explain, getting back to our own language: We have often received a book, say by Charles Dickens. We read it, and then along comes another book by Charles Dickens with the same title. We examine it, and we find that it is only just a resume of the previous book, and this is what happens with these others. To the outsider seeing the one book, a thick book, you say Well, what is this little thin book, what has that got to do with it? And we examine it, and find it is only a resume, but it has to be examined just the same as the others. There is that difference, which means to say that the book has to be examined.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Suppose that there is a book written in German or Russian or Polish on mineorology, or biology, he would not count that as a translation?—A. Yes, he would count that as a book. I want to be perfectly fair on that. The book goes to him because he has to scan it over, and keep record of it for another thing. I find he has been most careful in writing down every day, or rather every other day, the work that he has been performing. That is how he was able to file this return. A book may come to us from another department for examination; it is in a foreign language; we do not know whether it is a technical book, or whether it is a book that should not be allowed into Canada; it has to be looked at, it has to be examined, and there is always a possibility that a book which may seemingly be technical, upon examination may not be so. I have in mind one book, I think the title of it was "The Five Year Plan" or something of that sort. That book was all right from a technical standpoint until you began to read the summing up of it, then it was not all right.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I do not know that this question has very much to do with translation, but just for the purpose of information, because it is most interesting, was it seditious, or was it communistic?—A. It would come within the category of subversive literature, Mr. Chevrier.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I would like to go into that sometime, but I cannot because this is not translation.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. But suppose you receive a book on algebra in a foreign language, it is very easy to see that it is a technical book?—A. Yes. He does not read that at all, he would just simply note that down as having been received.

Q. And chemistry the same thing?—A. Yes, chemistry the same thing.

Q. I would like to know if these books which are essentially technical are included in those lists?—A. They are included, yes.

Q. Therefore, it is a very easy task to look through them?—A. Well, when I say they are technical I have not gone through the list myself to know just exactly what they are; but the percentage would be small, because the number of books that come over to us for examination are not so much technical as books that come pretty close to the one I just mentioned as to differentiating between socialism and communism; you see my point?

Q. Yes?—A. We would read that and would say well, this is a treatise by Carl Marx, for instance. Well, that is purely technical. And then there might be a book dealing with Carl Marx in a modern way which would not be technical.

Q. Therefore, he has translated or summed up 993 books in two years?—A. That is, books he has examined and passed on. Some he has passed through with a mere cursory remark; others he has gone into carefully and, where it was necessary, he has made a couple of paragraphs in writing up what the meaning of the book was. In some cases it would run into a couple of pages of foolscap. But I do wish to make myself clear, that it does not mean that he sat down and translated every one of those books and made a verbatim translation.

Q. Otherwise, you understand, it would be impossible?—A. It would be ridiculous, I quite agree with you.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You said "subversive". Might I ask you what is the standard? Is that subversive of morals, or peace, order, and good government?—A. Peace, order, and good government.

Q. You have to determine that?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And besides that, he has translated 1872 letters in the two years?—A. Yes. The letters for 1932 total 550, and for 1933, 1,322. Upon examination of these figures, I find, that dealing with Item Number 1, that is 31 in 1932 and 98 in 1933; they consist of letters translated from English to French in connection with answers to applications. Then Number 3, quite a large number of letters, 347 in 1932, and 424 in 1933. These are chiefly applications also for the R.C.M. police; also informers letters, as well as a certain amount of correspondence. We get letters frequently in a foreign language which we have to translate, and these require full translation.

Q. What are the 21 pages of German newspapers?—A. Newspapers?

Q. Yes?—A. That is to say, German newspapers, 21 pages in 1932, and 12 pages in 1933?

Q. Well, I mentioned German, it is immaterial. What I would like to know is, does the R.C.M.P. subscribe to those papers, or are they sent?—A. Oh, no, they come into our possession by devious means.

Q. By your agents?—A. Yes, by our agents.

Q. And they mark some articles?—A. They will probably mark some article.

Q. And you receive copies which are not marked and which have been glanced through?—A. We may receive some that are not marked, and we would receive some that are marked. It is quite conceivable that a constable would hear about a certain paper and he would submit it to us for examination; and another man knowing the language would mark the paper and submit it to us and we would be attracted to the article.

Q. But all that goes to Mr. Arnoni?—A. It all goes to Mr. Arnoni.

Q. And is the technical work mentioned included in the translation of books?—A. That is slightly different, Mr. Pouliot. We have instructions to issue, on occasion, questionnaires, and other forms to draft out, and they are submitted to Mr. Arnoni. He has recently compiled one for one branch of our service. That is what is referred to as technical work. It does not come in the same category as newspapers. Newspapers are—well, newspapers. But the technical work is where we are asked to make a form, or a judgment, from one language into the other. That comes in the category of technical work.

Q. Yes, and do you send work outside, that is, outside the Department of the Secretary of State? You have some translation work done by other departments?—A. Not by other departments. The translation that I have referred to is what we send out to the people I have already mentioned.

Q. Yes, but have you a few outsiders?—A. Just those that I have mentioned.

Q. Well, there is a note at the bottom of each statement:

“Also help given almost daily to outside translators.”

A. Well, what he means there is, that Mr. Levendel is an outside translator.

Q. Every time he sends him something— —A. No, no. Mr. Levendel comes in to the office, and he might not be quite sure of a certain work and he appeals to Mr. Arnoni.

Q. And therefore he records that every time?—A. Oh no. There might be something that Mr. Levendel is not quite sure on, and he wants to be sure he gets the exact meaning. It is just simply a courtesy between one and the other.

Q. Yes, it might be a case of shaking hands every day with Mr. Levendel?—A. I would not like to go so far as that. I must be fair. I think that Mr. Arnoni does try to be genuine in his statement. If he has misled us a little by saying “outside translators,” I do not think that was intentional, and I do not think it is a question of just shaking hands. I think that he really does try to do his best and help out wherever the opportunity occurs.

Q. Yes, but outside translators means Mr. Levendel?—A. Yes. I might also say this, that sometimes a letter might come in.

Q. Into your department?—A. Yes.

Q. But does it occur regularly?—A. Not regularly, I would not say regularly.

Q. It comes just occasionally?—A. Occasionally.

Q. And are those letters sent to you or to Mr. Arnoni?—A. They would go to the Records branch and be transferred directly to Mr. Arnoni to save time. We try to avoid circumlocution as much as possible.

Q. I do not think it will be necessary for you to look into the file, but if your memory serves you right, do you remember if General MacBrien, your chief, has written to the Civil Service Commission to the effect that Mr. Arnoni's work was strictly confidential?—A. He has, I believe, written to that effect. I have not seen the letter, but I know that much of his work is confidential.

Q. It is to your personal knowledge that Mr. Arnoni's work is confidential?—A. Yes, just for the same reason I mentioned with regard to the Jewish translator. This man has studied and has taken an interest in his work, and has made himself familiar with the situation which we have a great interest in.

Q. Mr. Arnoni?—A. Mr. Arnoni, yes. Therefore, when any book comes up, or any translation comes up, in which we have a vital interest it is a great help and a great advantage to us to have the opportunity of discussing just what the article actually means in words, because they have the ability, as we have found in the past, to discuss the real meaning, not a flow of language.

Q. Yes?—A. And it is excellent to have him to explain it. I might recite a case here that came to my own personal knowledge. We had a translation once which came to my office in Toronto by a Chinaman who translated a Chinese letter. I was just a sergeant at the time, but my superior decided that the letter should be translated by a professor. That was done and the two translations were remarkably different, but my translation happened to be the correct one because my man spoke the lingo of the underworld.

Q. The two translations were different?—A. They were different in Chinese.

Q. Yes, I know there are so many dialects in Chinese.—A. The translation by the university man detailed every meaning, whereas the one that I had knew the lingo of the underworld and made it perfectly clear that what I was looking for was right there, and that is why Mr. Arnoni is so useful to us because he can uncover the real meaning.

Q. The usual conversation language?—A. That is it, and that is why he is so valuable for us to have him on hand. To give the written translation would be giving us the bone without the meat.

Q. And that is why the R.C.M.P. is indifferent to his passing examinations?
—A. Well, I will not say we are indifferent.

Q. Well, do not insist so much on that?—A. I cannot say, because it had not come to my knowledge and, therefore, I cannot speak. All I can say is, that Mr. Arnoni has conscientiously, to my observation, endeavoured to study up the work from the police angle, and he reads voluminously, and I find he comes back quite frequently late at nights.

Q. How can you check his work?

The CHAIRMAN: Surely we are getting back to the old story.

The WITNESS: Well, I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: But I have, Mr. Darling. I want to get out of here sometime before next Christmas. There are a lot of important problems pertaining to civil servants that I want to get at and consider.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I will ask you one question before the last, and then I will explain to the Chairman why I asked you the question.

The CHAIRMAN: Please don't bother giving me any explanation.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Would it be possible for you to have your confidential work done by a central bureau of translation?—A. No, I don't honestly think it would be. I must be honest about that. I don't think it would.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Darling.

Witness retired.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we have asked Mr. Patenaude to come here this afternoon at four o'clock. Is there anything more you wanted from Mr. Bland in connection with the Translation Bill?

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask for the appearance of Mr. Coolican of the Post Office Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bland, until we are through with the Translation Bill you need not come back unless you are specifically asked for, and, of course, when we get through with the Translation Bill we will probably be asking you for information and assistance in connection with several other matters we want to consider.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Bland will not forget to see if he can find the details of that \$58,000 odd?

The CHAIRMAN: Is it not pretty well agreed that he cannot give you anything except what the printing bureau gives to him. Mr. Patenaude is coming here this afternoon. What about Mr. Coolican of the Post Office Department? Are we really getting anywhere, Mr. Pouliot, calling all of these men?

Mr. POULIOT: He is the last witness that I have, Mr. Chairman, after Mr. Patenaude, because the Post Office Department does translation for other departments. We have now had the Department of the Secretary of State and R.C.M.P.

The CHAIRMAN: All right.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The only one I was concerned about was Mr. DeMontigny, and I shall have to consider what to do in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn till four o'clock.

The committee adjourned at 12.45 p.m., to resume at four p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee resumed at 4.15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand Mr. Coolican is here from the Post Office Department.

P. T. COOLICAN called.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You are Acting Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Coolican?—A. Yes.

Q. And you wrote to the Civil Service Commission on April 17th about translation?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you please tell the committee if your department does its own translation?—A. Yes, practically wholly.

Q. Except a few letters in foreign languages?—A. Well, we also translate foreign languages to the extent of Spanish, Italian, Polish, Russian, and German to a certain extent.

Q. And the men of your own staff can translate those languages?—A. Yes.

Q. And when you send foreign letters or papers to the Department of the Secretary of State it is mostly for languages other than those you have mentioned?—A. Quite.

Q. And you do some work for other departments, such as the Department of Finance?—A. Yes, and the Department of Interior.

Q. The Department of Interior and the Department of Finance?—A. Yes, and the Tariff Board.

Q. Do you do foreign translation for those departments, or is it English and French?—A. Well, Polish and Yiddish for other departments occasionally.

Q. For departments other than the Department of Interior and Department of Finance?—A. I received one from the Governor General's office quite recently in Polish. We do those in our own department.

Q. And how does it work? Does the Deputy head of the department send the correspondence?—A. Yes.

Q. You give it to the translators?—A. Yes.

Q. And they give it back to you and then you return it?—A. Direct.

Q. Was there any notice sent by the Post Office Department to the other departments to the effect that you were able to do some foreign translation for them?—A. No, I think not; I do not recall one.

Q. How did it happen, Mr. Coolican, that the Department of Finance sends such a huge quantity of translation as 1,500 pages and 8,900 pieces each year during the last two years?—A. The only reason I can think of is that possibly they lost a translator, an expert translator, and knowing that we could do the work they used our translator for the sake of economy.

Q. It was just an arrangement between the two departments?—A. That is all.

Q. And the men who do the translation work for the Department of Finance, as well as for the Department of Interior, are under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General?—A. The men who actually do the translation?

Q. Yes.—A. Oh, yes, they are on our own staff.

Q. They do it for the Minister of Finance but they are under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General?—A. Yes, that is right.

Q. Have you some confidential work in translation?—A. Of our own, yes.

Q. Is the translation work in the Post Office Department technical work?—A. To a very large extent, yes, because there are many communications, particularly in French, which is the language of the Universal Postal Union.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What is the language of the Postal Union?—A. French, and many of the expressions used are practically technical expressions common to Post Office administration throughout the world.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Standard?—A. And translated in a standard manner.

Q. And the same thing applies to the correspondence?—A. Oh, yes, there is foreign correspondence.

Q. And besides the work that is done by the six translators in your department there is some translation actually done in each branch by bilingual people?—A. That must be, because there probably would be between 5 per cent and 10 per cent of our correspondence in French, which cannot be delayed, and which must get out to the public or postmasters immediately it is received.

Q. And the translation that is received by your department from the Department of Interior is in the same category as that received from the Department of Finance?—A. Yes.

Q. There is no special agreement about it?—A. No. It is done as a matter of convenience.

Q. You do some translation for the Department of Finance as well as for the Treasury Board?—A. I do not recall the specific instance, but we do.

Q. You do it for the Department of Finance at large?—A. Yes, whenever they wish to send it to us.

Q. Including the Treasury board?—A. Yes. We are very glad to do it.

Q. Does Mr. Justice Sedgewick send you some translation, or does it always come through the Department of Finance?—A. I cannot answer directly to that without looking it up. I am under the impression it comes from the Tariff Board itself.

Q. Through the secretary?—A. Yes.

Q. And, Mr. Coolican, are you in the matter of translation a self-sustaining department, with very few foreign exceptions?—A. With very few exceptions, yes.

Q. You do not send English or French translations outside?—A. No.

Q. And you do some foreign translations for other departments also?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In other words, you have all you can do, your staff is busy?—A. All the time, yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And is it necessary for you to have these men within the department?—A. We have a centralized translation branch within the department, which we consider should be retained there because of the technical aspect of the Post Office work with other administrations.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You have that centralized staff within the department?—A. Yes, we have it there for the purpose of seeing that important circulars or instructions to the public, or technical regulations are standardized, and are not done by any individual in any division.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Coolican.

Witness retired.

J. O. PATENAUDE, called.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Patenaude, there are only a few questions that I would like to ask you, and I do not know whether you can furnish me with the information just at present, but if you cannot you may be able to at a later date. It has been said that the translation is costing something between \$70,000 and \$80,000. Mr. Bland, speaking for the Civil Service Commission, said it was something like \$58,805. Now, what I would like to find out is, what is the actual cost of the translation, whether it be the translation from English into French, French into English, or authors' corrections, and then the corrections that are made at the printing bureau by your proof readers? I hope I am making myself plain?—A. Yes.

Q. In that item of \$58,805, I would like to have that apportioned. Is there any way by which you can do it?—A. Well, I brought Mr. Shipman with me. He is the director of printing, and I think he will be in a better position than me to answer those questions.

Q. You see, those are questions to which I want answers, and I do not think for the moment I have any further questions to ask you.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. There is a letter here, Mr. Patenaude, from you to the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, and you state here that author's alterations cost, I presume for the year 1933-34, \$58,805.25. What is meant by "authors' alterations"?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Wait a moment, did he say that?

Mr. MACINNIS: That is what he says here, "authors' alterations" \$58,805.25.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Then there is nothing to be charged to translation.

The WITNESS: Again I would like Mr. Shipman to answer that because he is in charge of all the printing and knows more about it. He can give you more correct answers.

J. C. SHIPMAN, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Shipman, I believe you are the director and superintendent, are you?—A. Director and superintendent.

Q. And, as such, have knowledge of the operations of printing, and the cost, and so forth, that is the approximate cost?—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What is really meant by "director and superintendent." What are your duties?—A. I am director and superintendent of printing. It is a combination.

Q. Now, have you seen a copy of this letter sent by Mr. Patenaude, King's Printer, to Wm. Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It states, that authors' alterations cost, for the year 1933-34, \$58,805.25. What is meant by "authors' alterations"?—A. When we receive the manuscript first it is set up, read by our own proof readers, and corrected according to copy; then the proof is sent to the department concerned.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let me get that right. Is it "authors' corrections"?

Mr. MACINNIS: If my eyes do not deceive me the words here are "authors' alterations."

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, but Mr. Bland said that the whole thing cost \$58.-805.25, translation and everything else.

The WITNESS: Oh no, this is only authors' alterations.

Mr. MACINNIS: I do not think you had quite finished your answer to the question as to what authors' alterations were.—A. When we receive a manuscript it is set up and read by our own proof readers, according to manuscript copy furnished, and the proof sent to the department concerned.

Q. I see. Now have you any idea as to what would be the major part of those authors' alterations, that is, in either the English or the French, or in the translations?—A. We have no means of finding that out. We might give the division as between the English and French, but it would be a very long operation to do so.

Q. Say in the speeches of members of parliament, do you get very many alterations in the proof when it comes back to you?—A. Well, sometimes. As a rule, they do not make very many though. Sometimes, when they are quite heavy, if it is an important speech.

Q. Are these changes in the original text, or mistakes made by the printing bureau?—A. Changes in the original text and mistakes made by the printing department are charged to composition before the proof goes out.

Q. Well then, the mistakes made by the printing department would be in this other item of \$489,205?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, where does my hon. friend get that?

The CHAIRMAN: This letter from Mr. Patenaude was read to the committee this morning.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have not got it.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course you have not got it. Mr. MacInnis just got it from the clerk.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Why did not the clerk send a copy to everyone of us.

The CHAIRMAN: He could not because he only got it this morning. Mr. MacInnis just requested it from the clerk this minute.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What is included in the term "composition"?—A. That is the type-setting.

Q. Have you brought with you any samples of corrections?—A. I just put one in my pocket. I only had about five minutes notice.

Q. Of those alterations?—A. Yes, I just have the one.

Q. Is that translation or authors' alterations?—A. This would be authors' alterations.

Q. Will you let me see it, please?—A. The first two pages are English and the balance is the translation of it.

Q. This is a translation, is it?—A. That is the English you are looking at. There are five, or six, or eight pages there of English, and then the French.

Q. Most of the alterations here would be printer's errors?—A. No, changes in copy mainly, or if there was an odd printer's error it would be missed by the proof reader.

Q. I would say that these would be printer's errors here. This is a translation from the English to the French?—A. Yes.

Q. And these corrections here were made after the first translation was made?—A. Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That does not mean anything on the record, Mr. Chairman. What can we get from that.

Mr. MACINNIS: Just a moment, please.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let us do it properly.

Mr. MACINNIS: Will you suggest how we should do it properly.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We cannot identify that in that way, and I am not saying that unkindly. The Chairman knows what I mean.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacInnis is referring the witness to what appears to be a photostat copy of the census of Canada, pages 896 and 897.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Produced by whom and under what conditions?

The CHAIRMAN: And, apparently is a photostat copy of the printing of those pages of the census of Canada, in French, with corrections thereon.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And selected by whom?

The CHAIRMAN: Produced by the witness.

Mr. CHEVRIER: But at whose instance.

Mr. MACINNIS: We asked for it this morning.

Mr. CHEVRIER: All right, I will take it for what it is worth.

Mr. MACINNIS: I am not attempting to show that any particular person made this translation, but I am showing that here, after the proof was made, after it was printed, there are a great many alterations in the translation. That is one of the vital things that we are concerned with in regard to this Bill.

The WITNESS: Perhaps I had better answer Mr. Chevrier.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. MacInnis, you are perfectly right. It is just a question of selecting a cross-cut. However, let it go for what it is worth.

Mr. MACINNIS: We asked the witness to bring certain exhibits with him. I have no objection; we can send a sub-committee from this committee to get the exhibits. I am not concerned in making a case against anybody, or even against the translators as a whole.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Neither am I.

Mr. MACINNIS: But there are certain things here which we should bring out. You have had a fairly free hand in this committee to bring out whatever evidence you want to bring out.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Now, as I see these, there are very few and very minor corrections in the original text, that is, in the reading of the proof, but when we come to the translated text there are a great many alterations. Anyone can see these, but if there are no segregated figures showing the cost of alterations in the translation, and the cost of those alterations, then I do not know if we can get very far?—A. We have not got that information available.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Shipman, you have produced here photostat copies of pages 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, and 873 of the census of Canada for 1931, the text of which are in English?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have also produced, Mr. Shipman, photostat copies of pages 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, and 897 of the census of Canada for 1931, the text of which is in French?—A. The translation of the previous pages.

Q. And the French text in these pages I have latterly named are the translation of the English text contained on the pages that I first named?—A. That is right, sir.

Q. It is obvious, by looking at these, that the number of corrections in the French text are enormously larger than those in the English text?—A. No question about that.

Q. Do these pages constitute a fair sample of the comparative amount of corrections which usually occur in English and French text, returned to the

printing bureau as authors' corrections?—A. No, I would not like to say that because, as a matter of fact, they come back fairly clean.

Q. Is the sample of the French text which you have produced here, containing authors' corrections, an example of the greatest degree of corrections which is usually required?—A. Well, we have had some worse.

Q. You have had some worse?—A. Yes.

Q. And some better?—A. Some better. I would say that would be the average.

Q. You would say that this is an average of corrections?—A. Yes.

Q. And these corrections, as I understand it, are entirely attributable to the translation from English into French, because before the document which this photostat copy represents is produced, the type has been set from an original French translation, and proof read by one of your proof readers?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all, thank you.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Those authors' corrections that you have just submitted were not due to the translators errors?—A. Are you speaking of these now, or authors' alterations in general?

Q. Yes, the ones that you have spoken of?—A. Yes, that Mr. Pouliot has there.

Q. The ones you have just spoken of to the Chairman?—A. I would say the majority of them were due to the translation.

Q. Just a moment now. When you get this first proof, say it is mine, I change the translation which the translator made; do you want to impute that to the translator or to me if I think that I have a better knowledge of the English or the French language?—A. We do not impute it to any person. We take the proofs from wherever they come and charge the authors' alterations irrespective.

Q. Perfectly right, but you cannot charge it, or you cannot say, or can you say, that these corrections are due to the faulty translation by the translator?—A. It is easily distinguishable by looking at the proofs. If you look at those proofs you will find a great many of the changes are in translation.

Q. We are not going to quarrel, Mr. Shipman; I appreciate your work as a mechanical expert down there, and you and I would probably never agree on the question of translation?—A. Never.

The CHAIRMAN: The witness says, look at them yourself and draw your own conclusion.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not going to let him say that that is due to translators errors in putting down on that copy, or in translating on that copy something which the author said and then the author changes it.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to let you have the idea that members of parliament have anything to do with changing the text in a census report; it goes back to the same author as translated it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that you have not got the same advantage that I have in speaking both French and English.

The CHAIRMAN: You would be surprised.

Mr. CHEVRIER: All right then, you have not looked at the translation, and I am not going to be told by anybody, that if I say "at once" or "immediately" whether that ought to be translated "tout de suite" or "immédiatement."

The WITNESS: It means the same thing.

Mr. CHEVRIER: If I make a correction in the unrevised Hansard, if I change one word to another, to whom do you charge that up, to the translation or to the cost of production?

The WITNESS: You are speaking now of Hansard?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Of anything?—A. Well, it would go to authors' alterations, irrespective of who made it.

Q. But it would not go to the cost of translation?—A. No, we have nothing to do with the cost of translation. The Bureau has nothing to do with the cost of translation.

Q. Well, who fixes the cost of translation?—A. The various departments, whoever are producing the translation.

Q. But tell me, where can I go to find the cost of translation?—A. You would have to go to each department furnishing translation.

Q. I will do nothing of the kind; I will get it in some other way. If I were to say to you that the establishment of a bureau of translation would stop a loss to the country of \$75,000 to \$80,000 on resetting and other work necessitated by revisions and corrections of unsatisfactory translations, what would you say about that?—A. What would I say to that?

Q. Yes?—A. I would not deal with the figures, because the figures I think refer to another year; but if you look at the translation that Mr. Pouliot has there, you will find a great many of the changes are made in order to have the translation uniform. Is not that so?

Mr. POULIOT: I will examine you later on this.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Will somebody tell me what \$58,805.25 has reference to? You said that was for authors' corrections?—A. Authors' corrections.

Q. And the other figures that you have available are for composition, including bureau corrections, and they amounted to \$489,305.53?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you segregate those?—A. As between?

Q. Well, the composition. I am not so much concerned about the composition as corrections. Are there any corrections in those \$489,305.53 that may be charged up to translation?—A. No, sir.

Q. So that the only available figure we have is that the office corrections amounted to \$58,805.25—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are these the only two amounts you can give me?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And no other? There is no other amount available, but the \$58,805.25 due to authors.—A. Authors' alterations.

Q. \$489,305.53 may be imputed to the composition, including the bureau corrections?—A. Bureau corrections.

Q. Outside of that there is no other information available?—A. No, sir.

Q. So that if anyone says the translation has cost between \$75,000 and \$85,000 it is a pipe dream?—A. I cannot say that. We do not know anything about the cost of translation.

Q. Will you leave it at that? There is no other information.—A. So far as the Printing Bureau is concerned.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And now take pages 866 and 867 of the Census of Canada, 1930, and tell the committee if, from the printers' point of view, it is a clean sheet?—A. It is a clean sheet.

Q. The same thing applies to pages 868 and 869?—A. Correct.

Q. The same thing applies to pages 870 and 871?—A. Yes.

Q. The same applies to 872 and 873?—A. Yes, the English text.

Q. From page 866 to 873 the text is English?—A. The text is English.

Q. Now, let us take pages 890 and 891 of the French text of the Census of Canada?—A. Yes sir?

Q. And these are not the corresponding pages of any one that I have already mentioned in English?—A. It should be, yes.

Q. It is not exactly the same?—A. Not the first page.

Q. But the continuation is supposed to be the same?—A. The continuation starts over on the far page.

Q. Those are not as clean pages as the ones already mentioned?—A. No, sir.

Q. From your experience as a man who has a thorough knowledge of type-setting and printing, will you tell the committee if the corrections on pages 890 and 891 in French came from the wrong disposition or drafting of the text which was sent to you in typewritten form, or if they are due to errors of the type-setter?—A. I would say most of them are due to the drafting.

Q. Due to the drafting? Is it reasonable for you to say that when you have not the original text of the typewritten copy which was sent to you, in order to compare both?

The CHAIRMAN: Can we not take it for granted that this witness is proceeding on the assumption, rightly or wrongly, that when one of his type-setters sets type from copy and that copy is compared by the proof-reader, the result is accurate. That is the supposition on which he is basing his whole case, rightly or wrongly; therefore he cannot answer your question except by saying, "in my opinion all the errors are due to translation." Now, he may be wrong, but that is the only way he can answer it.

Mr. POULIOT: And the only way to have a thorough knowledge of the matter is to have the original typewritten text to compare with this one.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you got the original typewritten text?—A. No, sir, I have no space to put it in.

Q. Once the proof is made and sent to the author, is the original typewritten text returned with it or thrown out?—A. Very seldom; generally retained by the department.

Q. Which department?—A. The department, sir.

Q. Not by the printing bureau?—A. No, not by the bureau.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Let us take pages 890 and 891. It will take a little more time to do this, but we will take out the corrections in one page, and if the committee is not satisfied with it, we cannot go wrong.

Mr. BOWMAN: Can we not see this thing?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bowman means, is it not obvious to the members of the committee?

Mr. POULIOT: I took the first French page we have in order to question the witness on that, because we know the original typewritten text—

The CHAIRMAN: If I may make a suggestion, I would suggest you take the last one, because there are many more corrections in it than the other, and it will give you more scope.

Mr. POULIOT: It would be better to take the first page and the last page, and then we both will be satisfied.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, on page 890 we notice a sign for a space here?—A. Yes, by the hyphenizing of a word there.

Q. Hyphenizing a word?—A. Yes.

Q. It is repeated three times?—A. Yes, four times.

Q. And a fourth time?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you say that the fact that the hyphen is not in the type-set form, is an error of the translator or an error of the type-setter?—A. I would not like to say the translator. I would say mainly it is the fault of the typist who typed the copy. I would say so far as that is concerned, it is according to the copy which we received at the bureau.

Q. And the missing of a hyphen is a very frequent error, as is also the dropping of a letter, and these small errors?—A. In type.

Q. Now, here is a comma?—A. Yes.

Q. Just a comma?—A. That is all.

Q. And what you have said about the hyphen applies also to the comma, and applies to all those small corrections. In the next, two words are replaced?—A. Yes.

Q. And apparently they are changed by the translator?—A. Correct—well, by the proofreader.

Q. No.—A. I would not say the translator, because I do not know.

Q. I am ready to presume that the two words in the text have been put there by the translator?—A. Yes.

Q. On the original typewritten copy?—A. Correct.

Q. And he has changed them when the matter was in page form?—A. Somebody changed them.

Q. Apparently it was changed?—A. Yes.

Q. You have a knowledge of French?—A. Yes.

Q. Those two words are about identical?—A. Except one is singular and the other plural, is it not?

Q. Look at them. This is plural and this is plural.—A. "Complet."

Q. Therefore this is not a mistake, it is just a change of two words?—A. Yes.

Q. On the line before the end of the paragraph?—A. Correct.

Q. And it is less expensive to change two words at the end of the paragraph than at the beginning of a paragraph?—A. No, not in that case because it takes up the same space in a line.

Q. That is not my question. I say that this change is not a mistake, is not the correction of a mistake, a gross mistake, it is just a change of words?—A. A change of words, that is true.

Q. But it is not a mistake in grammar?—A. Oh, well, no.

The CHAIRMAN: From the cost standpoint, what earthly difference does it make whether gross or minor, indecent or salacious, or anything else?

Mr. POULIOT: We cannot blame any translator who has a tendency to make his work perfect.

The CHAIRMAN: We are only trying to get perfection before it goes to the Printing Bureau—as near perfection as it can be.

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Pouliot, I do not want to interrupt this examination, but cannot we judge these things from looking at the document? I think I have a pretty fair idea of the point by looking at the document, just as I get an idea by looking at other documents. You do not need to spend an hour on this matter.

Mr. POULIOT: That is not the idea at all. The witness said that this was a mistake of the translator, that it was due to the mistakes of the translator that there were so many changes in that page. Now, what I have found out is that two words have been changed in several lines, perhaps by the translator or the reviser, that is all. I shall continue that page, if you wish.

Mr. BOWMAN: We all know that matters of punctuation and substitution of one word for another or a word omitted or something of that kind happens

in ordinary dictation, and therefore we can judge ourselves what those documents show without going into detail as to why this comma was missed, and why a semi-colon was put here, or a period somewhere else. I do not think we have to go into the history of every little change that is made in a document. You yourself can look at that and arrive at a safe conclusion.

Mr. POULIOT: I know that. I would be satisfied to take any page. I took the first one, and they are all alike. The Chairman said the last one was worse, and I was ready to ask the witness these questions, not for the pleasure of it, but just for the benefit of those who do not see these things and read the report of the committee; that is all.

Mr. BOWMAN: The only thing I wish to say is this, you are not going to add much to the record by giving the public the reason why a comma was left out here or a semi-colon not put in there, or a period put somewhere else. That is not going to help the record very much.

Mr. POULIOT: It would help the record to give justice to whom justice is due and not to blame the translators when the error may just as likely be the error of the typesetter. I do not say that to put a reflection on anyone, but just to prevent someone imputing mistakes erroneously.

Mr. MACINNIS: We are not trying to put anything on anybody; but if you take the author's work as printed from the typewritten copy, and then take the translation of the same thing, you will see a great many changes on the translation that you do not find in the office copy. I do not think there is any other conclusion we can come to than that the mistakes in translation are the chief cause of the—

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not a bit.

Mr. POULIOT: It is just on account of what you say that I examined the witness to bring light on the matter; that is all. Up to now some things to that effect have been said, and if you are not satisfied with the page I took, I will take a paragraph. If it will help you any, I will take any paragraph you mention, and we will discuss it with the witness and ask for some explanation. If you are not satisfied with two pages, or a page and a half, let us take a paragraph or anything you like. I am ready to do it.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have nothing to compare it with. What are you going to compare it with? Are you going to take a paragraph in that photostatic copy and compare it with some other paragraph in some other document? Cannot we get a general idea, if you are anxious to find out and to apportion the blame, if you like to put it that way, and therefore attribute the expenses of corrections to one document and not so much to another? Why not take the general picture, not the little details of this kind which really are not assisting the inquiry at all?

Mr. POULIOT: It is just to show how it goes. I have here a photostatic copy of some type-set pages, and there are some corrections here, and I asked the witness why these corrections were made; and as we cannot get the original typewritten copy, on which that type was set, I asked him why the corrections were made?

The CHAIRMAN: He cannot tell you that any more than any member of this committee could tell you. We all know that. If we see the correction of some hyphen we know perfectly well, and all the witnesses in the world could not help us, that that hyphen may have been left out in the original translation; it may have been left out by the stenographer who wrote the original translation, or it is possible it was left out in the Printing Bureau and missed both by the printer and proof reader; we all know that. When you come around to the next one, and he substitutes new French words for original words,

all the evidence in the world could not improve the position. We look at it, and we see what has been done on it. We know the words that were put in, and obviously we draw our own conclusions. What is the use of taking up the time of the committee in that regard?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think you have gone a long way in the latter part of your remarks. My concern is to try to find out whom not to blame, because I am not blaming anybody, but I am trying to find out the relativity between the changes. It is quite true when I speak in the House of Commons in English, my speech goes down to the translators, and they translate it; then it comes back to me as the unrevised edition, and I find fault with the translation. Now, it very seldom happens with an English speaking member of parliament, because he is not so much concerned, though he should be, about how his speech looks in French; because some day his speech will be read and he will be tripped, but I am concerned with my speech that I have delivered in English, that I want to see in French. I, as a member of parliament, have a right to change the grammatical construction of the sentences. I cannot change the tenor or intent of my speech, but if I do that and by adding a word or two and subtracting a word or two, I cause a change in the setting up of a column,—let us be fair, and let us—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chevrier—

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let us find out to whom it ought to be attributed, whether to the cost of translation or to authors' correction. Now, if you tell me why—

The WITNESS: No work done in the Printing Bureau is attributable to translations; we have nothing to do with translations.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Now, then, where will I go to find out how much of this \$70,000 or \$58,000 is attributable to the authors' corrections and to the translations? I say that they do translations one way, and the translator puts it in another way, who is going to pay?

The CHAIRMAN: Is it not obvious you cannot find out?

Mr. CHEVRIER: If I cannot find out, why does somebody say that it costs \$70,000 for translations, and the Secretary of State himself has said so, and I cannot find out.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know. I should hate to be held accountable for everything you said in the House.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will the hon. Secretary of State come in here and tell me where he gets those figures?

The CHAIRMAN: I should hate to be held responsible for what you say, and you would not want to be held accountable for what I say.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I want to find out who is to blame.

The CHAIRMAN: The whole thing to me seems a colossal waste of time. It starts off with this: Apparently someone said in the House of Commons during the year 1932, it cost between \$75,000 and \$80,000 to provide for corrections, translations, reprinting and so forth—

Mr. CHEVRIER: The Secretary of State went over to the Senate—I cannot use that evidence, because it is not printed yet, but I will use the 5 o'clock edition of the Ottawa Citizen, of Thursday, April 26, where he is reported as having said—he can correct me if I am wrong—"The establishment of a Bureau of Translation would save a loss to the country of \$75,000 to \$80,000 a year through resetting and other work now necessitated by revisions and corrections of unsatisfactory translation." Let him prove that.

The CHAIRMAN: I say to you that there is no obligation—

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will stay here until he does.

The CHAIRMAN: —no obligation on me or any other member of the committee to prove or disprove what somebody says. We are not responsible for that. I am only trying to summarize the situation here. The Secretary of State apparently said it cost \$75,000 in 1932—

Mr. CHEVRIER: For unsatisfactory translation.

The CHAIRMAN: —for satisfactory printed proofs of translation. We had another witness in here who advised us that an estimate of the Printing Bureau made and submitted for 1932 for that very purpose was between \$75,000 and \$80,000. We had Mr. Bland advise us for the year 1933-34 it was \$58,805. We have had witnesses exhaustively explain that you cannot segregate it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: How can you say—

The CHAIRMAN: We have had witnesses exhaustively explain that you cannot segregate the \$58,805 as between authors' corrections in English and authors' corrections in French. Now, we cannot get further than that. Why waste time on it?

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not wasting time; but I will sit here until Kingdom-come.

The CHAIRMAN: You are welcome to sit, but you will not get me to sit with you.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not care what you say. I am going to stick to my guns. You are sticking to yours. I am going to find out how that total of \$58,000 is made up, whether it is made up by the addition of four, five, twenty-five or thirty items, and just what about it. We say, there is a barrel of apples which contains 326 apples—

Mr. POULIOT: I will leave that aside for the moment, if the committee wishes, and I will approach you on another line of argument.

The CHAIRMAN: Do not let us have argument now. Let us ask the witness questions in regard to the matter before us, and reserve the argument until after.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I shall approach it then from another line of examination. Do you send all the proofs that come from the translations to each department for revision?—A. Surely.

Q. To each department?—A. Wherever we get the copy from.

Q. But how does it work? Do you receive the typewriter copy?—A. If we receive copy from the Department of Trade and Commerce, the proofs go back to the Department of Trade and Commerce. If from the Interior, the proofs go back to the Interior.

Q. With galley proof?—A. Galley proof and the page proof.

Q. You send it twice?—A. Twice, yes.

Q. You send it first— —A. In galley form.

Q. With the— —A. Manuscript copy.

Q. And then, after it is corrected you send it back again in page form with the galley?—A. With the galley, that is it.

Q. Do you do that with the House of Commons debates or do you make the corrections at the bureau?—A. You are speaking of English or French?

Q. French.—A. French, no.

By the Chairman:

Q. The translation from English into French?—A. Of the daily edition, no, only the revised edition.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And for the Senate, is it the same thing?—A. The Senate is the same thing, no—the English proofs come back, the French, we do not know what will happen it because we have just printed one issue.

Q. I mean the revised French Hansard. Is it corrected at the Bureau?—A. At the bureau.

Q. And the law translation?—A. The law translations, yes.

Q. Do you send back the proof to them?—A. Surely.

Q. For revision?—A. Every time.

Q. Then you send them back to the department?—A. To all departments.

Q. Now sir, I will ask you a general question about that page there, two general questions, which will be very short. Can you say sir, if anything besides the words which are very few in page 830, very few in the margin, have been corrected, are mistakes by the translator rather than the type-setter?—A. Yes; I would say yes to that.

Q. Why?—A. Because it would be so many of them. The type-setter would not make the mistakes that are there unless they were in the copy. The main difficulty in those proofs is that there has been an endeavour made to make the translation uniform throughout, and that has caused the greater part of the work in connection with that. You take this type: "Tous les parties du recensement" has been changed by the addition of "de la division" on the first line of the paragraph, which means that that paragraph has to be overrun. You find that right there.

By the Chairman:

Q. Does "over-run" mean the same as "run-over"?—A. Hardly, no.

Q. I do not know what "over-run" means?—A. It means you have got to run type two or three words from this word up on the next—

Q. All the way down?—A. All the way down. You will find that right through.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You might look it over, but not over-look it.

The WITNESS: In another case, they change the French word "frontieres" to "limites." The French word for that had been changed prior to us receiving the copy. We would not have all of those alterations. There is where the difficulty comes in. You find that right through the whole.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. You will admit they did not receive the instructions until the type was set in page form and forwarded to the Chief of the Department?—A. That may be; I do not know anything about that. Of course, all that we deal with is as we receive it.

Q. And here you have "refondus" replacing "consolives"?—A. No printer would make that mistake.

Q. I admit that, but it must have been done in order to bring about uniformity in the text?—A. Quite so.

Q. And it is probably because the same matter has been translated by several translators?—A. Quite so. In order to save expense, if that uniformity were arrived at prior to the original manuscript coming to the bureau then all this would be avoided.

Q. From your personal experience, Mr. Shipman, as the superintendent of the printing bureau, can you say if it is less costly to have one piece of work, or a report, translated by the same man?—A. I would say, without question, by the same man.

Q. Because there will be more uniformity?—A. Because there will be more uniformity?

Q. And less corrections?—A. That is it. That is all the bureau is interested in.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Shipman, what is your occupation at the printing bureau?—A. Director and superintendent of printing.

Q. Have you got a photostat establishment down there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Since when?—A. Quite a few years.

Q. Have you been in the habit of photostating everything that is going through the bureau?—A. No, sir.

Q. Well now, I do not know who produced those. Would you kindly enlighten me as to who produced those.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shipman.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Where did you get them from?—A. We photostatted them at the bureau.

Q. Since when have you been in the habit of photostatting everything that goes through the bureau?—A. No. We photostat everything that we think might be needed.

Q. Why did you photostat these?—A. Because we have been having a whole lot of that sort of thing throughout the session—

Q. Just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Let him answer.

The WITNESS: That causes us about 50 per cent more work, and then when the job is—

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What causes you about 50 per cent more work?—A. When the job is finished some person comes along and says "That cost too much", and it is only for protection in case that question was raised that we had these few copies photostatted.

Q. Protection, of course, is one of the first virtues, but last year did you photostat any of those?—A. No.

Q. Or the year before?—A. Not of the Senate that you have there.

Q. You have never photostatted any of the Senate until this year?—A. Well, now, I would not say no.

Q. Well, did you?—A. I do not know, not that I remember.

Q. So far as you know, this is the first year that you have photostatted those?—A. Yes.

Q. Why did you do it?

The CHAIRMAN: He has just finished explaining. I have put up with enough of this, Mr. Chevrier, wasting the time of this committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You have not put up as much with me as you are going to put up with.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, go ahead and we will see who is boss for a while.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You had a certain reason for photostatting these. Do you know how this is done?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got to photostat everyone of these things separately?—A. Not necessarily.

Q. Well, how many of this galley, which is about 22 inches long—and some of them are much longer than that—how many exposures must you take of these?—A. I would say we would take two at a time, possibly three.

Q. You and I will not quarrel about this, Mr. Shipman, but I have counted them up, and I find that in these galley proofs, some of them being 22 inches long, 24 inches long and even 30 inches long, there are something like 75 pieces of these. Now, have you any idea what the cost of that would be?—A. Photostatting?

Q. Yes?—A. It would be practically the cost of the paper.

Q. And the time?—A. It would be done by a man who is doing other work. We have not got an operator to do that all the time.

Q. Where do you go for it then?—A. For which?

Q. The operator?—A. One of the men working in that branch.

Q. But you have got to pay him?—A. Yes.

Q. How much would it cost to photostat all of those?—A. I would not like to make even a guess at it.

Q. I think you had better not.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, I am not going to permit you to make remarks of that kind. The witness has, I think, fairly answered you, that he cannot give you an estimate and you made the remark that he had better not.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Well, I will leave it at that. Now then, someone has reduced the Dominion government report of the commission of inquiry, something about the sale of wheat I suppose, and I notice that there are something like 91, and there are about 8 or 9 annexes. Have you any idea what the cost of printing that would be, to photostat those I mean?—A. No.

Q. No idea at all?—A. No. I have an idea, but I do not care to give the figure.

Q. Well, give me your idea.—A. No, sir.

Q. If you have an idea you might just as well give it to me. You said you did not know what it cost.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Could you give an approximate idea, Mr. Shipman?—A. That is, the total cost, paper and all?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Cost of paper, labour, and everything else that goes to make those up?

Mr. MACINNIS: How many pages did you say there were there?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Will you give me that idea?—A. I would say a couple of dollars.

Q. I have had my breath taken away from me a number of times in this committee, Mr. Shipman, but do you mean to say it would only cost a couple of dollars to photostat all those, with the cost of the paper and labour?—A. There would be no time chargeable to that.

Q. The man who works at it must be paid. How many hours would a man take to photostat those 100 copies?—A. 100 pages.

Q. Fifty exposures?—A. Not necessarily. He would do a number at one time.

Q. I do not want to quarrel with you much less with the Chairman, but now, to be fair with me, tell me without any further argument?—A. I have told you frankly, I do not know.

Q. Now, you have produced these. I notice this is dated "Senate Hansard, November 8th, 1933," it looks like. Have you any idea, Mr. Shipman, who could explain to me how it has come about that these pages, or manuscript with directions, have come to be made?—A. I would say the translator of the Senate, whoever that would be. I cannot give you his name.

Q. The translator of the Senate, whoever it was at that time, would be responsible?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Might I ask a question, Mr. Shipman, in connection with these photostat copies to which Mr. Chevrier has been referring. You said they were taken for the purpose, shall I use the word, of the protection of your department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From being accused of spending too much time in connection with the printing of a particular report?—A. Yes, sir. We have done it off and on for the last ten years.

Q. And you found, with certain of the material which came to you in manuscript form, had so many corrections finally that you took this precaution to keep a record of what actually took place?—A. That is it, Mr. Bowman.

Q. Now, Mr. Chevrier was asking you with respect to the cost of those 100 sheets, to which you give a proximate figure of \$2. That would be for what? When you were talking about \$2 what had you in mind?—A. The paper.

Q. The paper itself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The machine belongs to the department, does it?—A. It belongs to the department.

Q. And the work of actually doing those photostatic copies is done by an employee of the department?—A. Yes.

Q. During his spare moments?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, as I understand it, when a manuscript comes to you you try to reproduce that manuscript exactly in the form in which it does come to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, word for word?—A. Word for word.

Q. Punctuation?—A. Unless the punctuation is wrong or the capitalization is wrong, when we change it.

Q. So that, really speaking, few changes are made under the authority, shall I say, of the officials of the printing bureau?—A. Practically none.

Q. But that after you have made the first proof, and that has gone back to the department responsible for that particular Blue Book or whatever document it may be, then corrections are made once more and come back to you for final printing?—A. Final printing, yes.

Q. Now, does it ever happen that they come back to you more than once?—A. Oh, yes, two, three, and four times.

Q. Some of these documents come back to you two, three, and four times?—A. Yes. Take the Senate debates that we were talking about a moment ago. We send them out three and four times, and then when they come back finally they would be nearly as bad as the copy.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. That would be the translation?—A. The translation.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. So that you not only print a document once, but sometimes three and four times before it is finally ready to be set up?—A. Ready to be printed, yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Shipman, there was one other thing the committee wanted to get from the printing bureau, and so that you can understand it let me give you this explanation: A statement was made in the House of Commons that you were not able to keep a given number of employees employed with a degree of continuity throughout the year, and that one of the reasons for that was that you got a deluge of translation to be printed at some seasons of the year and none at all at others, and the argument based on that set of facts was, that if a bureau of translation were established it could be worked out so as to give greater continuity of printing work in respect to translation to the printing bureau?—A. No question, that would assist the bureau.

Q. Well now, because of that, some of the members of the committee requested that you might let us have a statement showing when you receive printed matter from a department for printing, the date on which you receive it, and the date on which you send it back, taken over a sufficient period of time to give a fair picture of the spasmodic flow of your bureau, so far as printing is concerned. Would it be possible for you to get that for the committee, and would it be a very laborious job?—A. Does that cover the reports as asked for by the House, annual reports?

Q. It covers everything which has to be translated and printed.—A. Well, we could do it.

Mr. BOWMAN: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Shipman could not give us the general picture now.

The CHAIRMAN: He has already said, that there is no question but what, in his opinion, the establishment of a bureau would enable them to have a greater continuity of employment for a given number of people.

The WITNESS: That applies not only to the translation but to the original English copy. You see, our year ends on the 31st of March, and we should have some of that copy done during June, July and August when we need it most.

By the Chairman:

Q. We are only interested in the copy you receive as a result of translation. A. Well then, the sending down of the English copy affects the time at which we could receive the French, because if the English is not finished the French translation cannot go ahead.

Q. Well, would it be possible for you to get us out any figures that would be illuminating in regard to that problem?—A. I will try to.

Q. And how long would it take, have you any idea?—A. When do you meet again, next Wednesday?

Q. Yes.—A. We will have something for you then, as far as we can go by that time.

Mr. BOWMAN: Personally, Mr. Chairman, I think if we got the general picture which I have more or less in the back of my mind, surely we can get a general idea sufficient for the purpose of this committee without a written report being presented to us. Take, for instance, Mr. Shipman, in the matter of getting out the translation of English documents, or reports, or Blue Book into French. As I understand it, the procedure now is that the document in English is first finally completed?—A. That is generally the case. There are a few exceptions.

Q. There is the odd exception?—A. Yes.

Q. Then after that has been completed and printed in the final form, the original comes to you, and in due course that document goes down and is translated, goes down in a translated form for printing into the French language?—A. That is it.

Q. And I understand that sometime it happens, that a year, or a year and a half or often two years transpires before the French printed document is ready for publication?—A. Yes, sometimes it is so long that they do not translate it at all.

Q. That is, the usefulness of the document has disappeared?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, is there anything to hinder documents of that nature, which are to be finally translated into French, being brought down, the English itself in manuscript and the French translation, both at the same time?—A. There would be an advantage in having the French follow the English. For instance, if a report consists of a lot of tabular matter, we just take the tabular matter, change the headings and use it for the French; it could be set for both, but if there are any changes made in the original manuscript copy, then every change which is made in the English must be made in the French.

Q. It does seem to me that there should be some steps taken to improve or to hasten rather the translation of the English into French if the French documents are going to be of any value at all?—A. Yes, they should come pretty close together.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is it not so, by effective law, that the reports of a number of departments are to be deposited on the table of the House at the opening of the session?—A. Within a certain number of days.

Q. Yes, and that once they are deposited then the translation takes place and then you start off to do the printing?—A. No, in a great many cases, in fact the majority of cases, I think you will find in the last few years the English and French reports have been tabled at the same time.

Q. What proportion of the delay in printing is due to translation, have you any idea?—A. I do not know just what you mean by that.

Q. I mean, as to the amount of reports that we get, what is the proportion of those that are translated and that are in arrears, that are not produced at the same time?—A. Well, of course, that varies from year to year. It would be hard to say what the proportion is. It is getting smaller all the time.

Q. Now, having been with the printing bureau as long as you have been, and not having managed it too badly, have you any suggestion to make as to how the English and French or the French and English reports could be published at the same time?—A. Well, I should say if the translations were made from the original English and then held until all the changes necessary were made in the English, then send the translation right to the bureau, but very often it is months before that is done.

Q. That is the remedy that you would suggest, that the English ones be held a little longer?—A. That is, the French be held a little longer.

Q. That is, the English report be held a little longer so as to give time to translate it into French?—A. No, that is not it; that the French report be translated from the English manuscript and not wait until the English report is printed.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Are these exhibits from the various departments?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are selected by chance?—A. By chance. As we thought of it, we made photostat copies.

Q. But are they not some of the more corrected ones?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. As a rule, the copies are cleaner than that?—A. Well, sometimes they are. I would not like to say as a rule.

The CHAIRMAN: Do the members of the committee desire Mr. Shipman to endeavour to prepare the information and the statement along the lines I indi-

cated here a moment ago, or are they satisfied that no good purpose is to be served by it?

Mr. POULIOT: On account of what you said this afternoon, what we would like to have would be a summary based on the list of official publications which is given to every member at the beginning of the session, showing the quantity of pages which you have received from each department, indicating the date on which you received it during 1932 and 1933. For instance, take any department. Say you received 100 pages, 20 on such and such a date, 15 on such and such a date, and the balance later.

The WITNESS: All right, sir.

Mr. POULIOT: What I would like to know is, what quantity of French text and English text you have received.

The WITNESS: You want that in both English and French?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, because you said that the English has also been delayed, at least it took some time to get it in the translation. I understood you to say that.

The CHAIRMAN: No. He said, that obviously that if the English text were had at an earlier date and printed, then that, in turn, would enable the French translation to be delivered at an earlier date.

Mr. POULIOT: And it would give work to the men all the time?

The CHAIRMAN: He did not say that.

Mr. POULIOT: I presume that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Naturally it would help to spread it out, but then, Mr. Pouliot, even that is not going to show you the cost factor, because some of this material goes down not once but three and four times.

Mr. POULIOT: I want the original typewritten copy. I am not going to bother about the corrections. It is the galley proofs or the pages, you understand what I mean?

The WITNESS: Yes, I do.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. A record in your department of the manuscript which you receive daily throughout the year?—A. Yes, but it is going to take quite a lot of work to get that out for two years. I do not know just how long that will take. Take one report, there might be fifty, sixty, or one hundred entries in it, but I do not think you want every entry.

Mr. POULIOT: No, no. What I want is the number of pages that are sent to you. For instance, there is the Commercial Intelligence which you receive weekly. It is not necessary to mention every time you receive it. You need only mention that you receive the Commercial Intelligence weekly.

Mr. BOWMAN: Just the ones that you enumerated in the document which you presented this morning?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and not all those papers or documents which are mentioned, just that list.

The WITNESS: All right, I can do that.

By the Chairman:

Q. Will you prepare that and send it in to us by next Wednesday, if possible?—A. If we cannot complete it we will send in what we have prepared.

Mr. BOWMAN: Is there any particular advantage in having it for the two years?

Mr. POULIOT: One year is enough, 1933.

Mr. BOWMAN: What I mean is, you just want to get the picture?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Shipman, have you got a system at the printing bureau whereby you keep track of the cost, because we are concerned with first, as to the efficiency of translation. The Bill says so anyway, and the economy and the cost of translation. Now, have you got a system down there so that I could go down and look over your records and could find out just what a page of Hansard would cost?—A. Yes we have all that, that is for the printing of it.

Q. Oh yes. Supposing now, for the purpose of illustration, that a clean sheet of Hansard came down to you; it would not be my speech, because mine are not so immaculate as that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Nor mine.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But supposing you got a nice page of copy, you could determine at once—I mean if there were no alterations—what the cost of production of that page would be in the way of paper, and everything else. And supposing, on Hansard, for instance, that after you have printed that copy and it comes to me and I make certain changes in it, and then it goes back for the revised edition, have you got means of checking the supplementary cost that my corrections would entail?—A. Not the individuals, no sir.

Q. No means of checking it individually, but there are some means of checking the amount of time or labour that the change that I would make in my speech would cost the bureau?—A. Well, we keep no record to that effect, because the revised edition goes through as a revised edition.

Q. When I send back my page with probably three or four corrections on it, it has got to be set up again. Of course, that is my fault; I am a member, I have to carry the blame for that, but somebody down there is working during that time, and it costs a certain amount of money to correct my changes. Say the first page cost \$1.22 and that these additions cost 19 cents or \$1.25?—A. Not in connection with the Hansard.

Q. Now, is there not any other material?—A. Yes, we keep our corrections.

Q. On the jobs. I suppose you must keep that in order to be able to put a price out?—A. Yes, it is all priced by the hour, the number of hours.

Q. And then you allocate certain hours to certain jobs?—A. We use the standard cost finding system.

The CHAIRMAN: Anything further, gentlemen.

The WITNESS: There is just one thing I would like to say and that is, that after the close of the fiscal year on the 31st of March, if some means could be taken to get the annual reports into the printing bureau during the summer months it would mean a great saving to us. In Washington they have got to be in within three months.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. They come into your department at irregular intervals?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. That is a very good suggestion, Mr. Shipman, but would it not be better for someone with authority under the jurisdiction of the King's Printer, to go around the different departments to see that it is delivered on time?—A. But we have no authority.

Q. No, no, but if some gentleman had authority under Mr. Patenaude?—A. We do ask them to do it.

Q. It would be a connecting link between the bureau and all the departments?—A. Even Mr. Patenaude himself could not go to a department and say, "Here, get your report down."

Q. No, no, I do not mean that, but it would help you to have somebody with authority from the printing bureau to go around to the various departments and see that the work is delivered on time to you?—A. We do that, we have men in the bureau who do that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It could be done at present if instructions were given.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Is it really up to the Deputy Minister of each department to get his report finished and in as soon as possible. You would like to have them in early so that you could keep your staff employed?—A. Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not going to ask you whether you could do it just as well without this Bill.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a matter for the printing bureau.

Mr. POULIOT: I have a slight correction to make, on page 144, the report of April 25, the second last question. It reads:—

and for sometime the hon. Mr. Casgrain and a compatriot served with Mr. Meighen; bilingual people were on the staff.

What I said was:—

and for sometime the hon. Mr. Meighen, Mr. Aime Geoffrion, and the hon. Mr. Justice Migneault were commissioners.

Mr. BOWMAN: How much is it going to cost to make those corrections?

The CHAIRMAN: We will meet at 11 o'clock next Wednesday morning, and as we apparently now have finished, so far as the evidence is concerned, with the exception of getting that statement from the printing bureau, I suggest that we take up Bill 4 clause by clause, and then if you leave it to me I will work out with the clerk, having available some of the members of parliament who have written the clerk of the committee and suggested that they wished to make representations here in connection with Civil Service matters, and then following that we will hear from Mr. Phelan and Mr. Knowles, I think, representing the big organizations.

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, it being understood that we complete Bill Number 4 first.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh yes, those are the original instructions, to clean up Bill Number 4.

The committee adjourned at 6 p.m. to meet again on Wednesday, May 9, 1934, at 11 a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 7

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1934

WITNESSES:

J. O. Patenaude, King's Printer.

J. C. Shipman, Director and Superintendent of Printing, Printing Bureau.

F. Bronskill, Accountant, Department of Public Printing.

Adrien Potvin, Civil Service Commissioner.

Messrs. Plunkett, Barber, Casselman and Shaver, Members of Parliament.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson, presiding.

Members present: Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, Ernst, Bowman, Chevrier, MacInnis, and Pouliot.

Mr. C. W. Bland, Commissioner, in attendance.

Bill No. 4 was again taken under consideration.

Mr. J. O. Patenaude, King's Printer was recalled, examined and discharged.

Mr. F. Bronskill, Accountant, Department of Public Printing was called, examined and discharged.

Mr. Adrien Potvin, Civil Service Commissioner, formerly an official of the Senate, called, examined and discharged.

The committee then took under consideration the said Bill No. 4, clause by clause.

Clauses 1 and 2—adopted on division.

Clause 3 (1). On motion to adopt, Mr. Chevrier moved, in amendment that the words, "and both Houses of Parliament," in the 5th and 6th lines thereof and the words, "debates, bills, Acts, proceedings" in the 10th line thereof, be struck out.

Motion to amend lost.

Mr. Chevrier then moved that the words "bills, Acts, proceedings" in the 10th line thereof, be struck out.

This motion to amend was lost.

Subclause (1),—adopted on division.

Subclause (2),—adopted on division.

Clause 3,—adopted on division.

Clause 4 (1).

On motion to adopt clause 4 (1), Mr. Chevrier moved in amendment that the words "including all the employees of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada," in the 3rd and 4th lines thereof and the words "debates, bills, Acts, proceedings" in the 6th line thereof and the words "including the translation into either the English and French language of the debates and proceedings of the Senate and House of Commons" in the 7th, 8th and 9th lines thereof, be struck out.

Motion to amend lost.

Clause 4 (1),—adopted on division.

Clause 4 (2).

On motion to adopt Clause 4 (2).

Mr. Chevrier moved in amendment that the subclause be amended by adding thereto the following words, viz.: "but nothing in the present Act shall affect the status of the translators of debates, bills, Acts or proceedings of the Senate or House of Commons."

Motion in amendment lost.

Mr. Chevrier then moved by amendment that subclause (2) be amended by adding at the end thereof the words, "in accordance with section 50 of the Civil Service Act".

Motion to amend lost.

Clause 4, (2),—adopted on division.

On motion to adopt clause 4, Mr. Laurin moved to amend the same by adding the following as subclause (3). "(3). All translators or other employees transferred to the bureau as provided for in subsections one and two of this section shall be paid at rates not less than the rates such persons were receiving prior to their transfer to the bureau."

The chairman ruled this amendment out of order as involving the expenditure of public funds.

Clauses 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8,—adopted on division.

Title adopted on division.

The chairman was instructed to report the bill.

The meeting adjourned till 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee re-convened at 4 p.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Mr. Plunkett, M.P., Mr. Barber, M.P., Mr. Casselman, M.P., and Mr. Shaver, M.P., appeared before the committee and made representations respecting certain classes of civil servants.

It was agreed that Mr. Neill, M.P., the Civil Service Federation of Canada, the Canadian Legion of the British Empire League, and Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada and the Professional Institute of Civil Service of Canada, by their respective representatives, should be heard at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned till Wednesday, May 16 at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,
Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, May 9, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. J. Earl Lawson presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Patenaude and Mr. Shipman were going to endeavour to prepare memoranda as to when they received different reports and documents from the departments; is that available?

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, on page 195 of the evidence a correction was made and there is a mistake in the correction. The mistake that was made in the first instance was corrected and another mistake was put in its stead in the correction, and, therefore, I will have to correct it. The name "Mr. Meighen" in the second correction should be replaced by the name "Hon. Mr. Tom Chase Casgrain" and the sentence should now read "and for some time the Hon. Mr. Tom Chase Casgrain, Mr. Aimé Geoffrion, and the Hon. Mr. Justice Migneault were commissioners."

The CHAIRMAN: I asked Mr. Patenaude to prepare a memorandum showing approximate dates when they received material for printing and so on, and I think he has that statement available.

Mr. PATÉNAUDE, recalled.

The WITNESS: These are duplicates.

(Memoranda produced).

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, is there anything else from Mr. Patenaude?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not for the moment, thank you.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to ask some questions about the production of photostatic copies.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Patenaude, some photostatic copies were brought to us the other day, and some of them concerning the Shipping Bill were brought by Mr. Shipman—A. Yes.

Q. That is the case, Mr. Patenaude, is it not?—A. I do not recall it.

Q. Did you bring those photostatic copies—all those that were brought before the committee—did you bring them from the Printing Bureau at the time of the last sitting?—A. No. We did not bring them with us. No, they were in the House of Commons.

Q. Where were they in the House of Commons?—A. They were in the Minister's office.

Q. In whose office?—A. Mr. Cahan's office.

Mr. LAURIN: They came first from the Printing Office?

The WITNESS: Yes, naturally.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. And when were those photostatic copies made?—A. They were made at the Bureau.

Q. At what time?—A. They have been making them for the last ten years, I think.

Q. Photostatic copies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why were those copies selected to be brought before the committee?—

A. There were no selections made.

Q. No selections made?—A. No.

Q. But, Mr. Patenaude, take, for instance, the Shipping Bill: your name appears on the front page of the Bill as King's Printer—A. Yes.

Q. And you know very well that the Bill is 548 pages?—A. Well, likely. I do not remember.

Q. It is admitted. Ten pages only, and some in English, were copied by photostat?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Yes?—A. Very likely. I take your word.

Mr. BOWMAN: They have been produced.

Mr. POULIOT: They have not been produced. The only ones that have been produced are the Census of Canada, and all the other photostatic copies that have been produced have not been produced regularly, and the Census of Canada are the only ones that have been mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: All these photostatic copies were filed with the committee at the first sitting.

Mr. POULIOT: They were not put in order. You know, Mr. Chairman, that we should see to it that the exhibits are filed in order that we can trace them afterwards; and, therefore, I did the work. I have put the number of pages of the Census of Canada in English and in French, and I have given it back to Mr. Fraser just as I have done with these others that have been received from the departments, and I would like to have these documents filed regularly by asking Mr. Patenaude if these are really pages from the Census of Canada coming from the Printing Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not stopping you.

Mr. POULIOT: It is only to make the evidence clearer.

The CHAIRMAN: All that you have in front of you, as far as I am concerned, is filed with the committee.

Mr. POULIOT: I believe it is very hard to trace it, because it was all brought like a haystack.

Mr. ERNST: Mr. Pouliot is saying that it is not evidence because it was not brought direct from the Bureau, it came from the Minister's office.

Mr. POULIOT: No, it is not that. All of these photostatic copies were brought to us in a bundle, and we do not know from what book they come, and I took the trouble to verify the number of pages in the books.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have no objection to them going in with the understanding that the stenographic notes attached to the photostatic copies have been made by Mr. Pouliot.

The CHAIRMAN: They are in.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The Shipping Bill has 548 pages?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Printing Bureau has brought here 10 pages of photostat?—A. Yes.

Q. How was that selection made and why?—A. I cannot answer that.

Q. Why?—A. Because I might give you in a few words what we have been doing in the past—my predecessor—to protect the Bureau. As I said the last time, they accuse us of overcharging the different departments in the cost of printing.

Mr. BOWMAN: And delays.

The WITNESS: And delays.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The delays would not appear in the photostat.

The WITNESS: No, but it is there; so we have photostat copies. I gave instructions. I am not always aware that they have been doing it—I do not remember—but it has been done with my sanction that whenever they find a horrible copy like this one and many others we photostat each and leave them there, and later on we can say to those who are charging us “Here is proof” on account of such a bad copy.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. That is all right. Therefore, the Printing Bureau has selected the bad pages?—A. Naturally we are using the worst pages.

Q. And, therefore, in a book of 548 pages there are 10 bad pages?—A. I will take your word for it. I do not know.

Mr. BOWMAN: He has not said that they produce all the pages; he said 10 pages.

The WITNESS: We do not produce the good pages, naturally; there would be no reason for that. We are not making a case for or against translation; we are only protecting the Bureau.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, talking about the protection of the Bureau, who attacks you on account of the high charges?—A. Oh, well, we are not attacked, but sometimes we are questioned by the different accountants of different departments why we charge them so high. We will say because there are so many corrections—bad copies.

Q. That is all right. When you give the explanation they must be satisfied?—A. Very likely, yes.

Mr. LAURIN: You give them evidence of it?

The WITNESS: Certainly, they make enquiries; they are trying to ask the reason why the charge is so high, and we give reasons.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. And the best proof you have is the reproduction of the material which has been submitted to you?—A. Exactly.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Do you remember whether the pages in the Shipping photostat copies are in French?—A. No, I do not remember.

Q. Will you check it please?—A. Yes.

Q. It is filed as exhibit “A.” Can you tell the committee if in the remaining 538 pages there are many pages which are just as bad as these 10?—A. No, I could not tell you that.

Q. You cannot tell that?—A. No.

Q. But you know very well that the exception is not the general rule?—A. Yes. Well, I think so. These are exceptions, naturally—bad pages.

Q. They are exceptions?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Therefore, the remainder of the portions are much cleaner than these ten pages?—A. I am not prepared to say that because I have not seen them.

Q. You have no reason to say anything to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN: He has not seen them; consequently he could have no reason to say anything to the contrary.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Have you any reason to say the contrary?

The WITNESS: No. I could not say until I have seen the thing, and I do not say things I do not know.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. According to your memory, can you tell the committee if the cost of composition or the type setting cost, including author's translations, of the average pages of this book are higher than the average pages of any other publication that goes to the Printing Bureau?—A. No. I am not prepared to say that, no.

Q. You cannot say?—A. Naturally, I could not say that, no.

Q. And you did not have these photostatic copies made because the average cost per page of this book at the Printing Bureau was higher than that of any other book?—A. No. I am not prepared to say anything about that.

Q. You do not know anything about it?—A. No.

Q. You did not check it?—A. No.

Mr. MACINNIS: He has already given his reasons for making a photostatic copy.

The CHAIRMAN: That has been dealt with over and over again.

Mr. POULIOT: No, it is not that; because if we look at that as a true sample of the whole thing it is not right.

The CHAIRMAN: We will not look at it as a true sample of the whole picture; we will look at it exactly as we have been told it is; namely, that at that time there was a complaint as to costs in connection with the Printing Bureau and, therefore, the Printing Bureau selected certain pages of different documents in which they had to do a great deal more type setting and so forth because of corrections. They photographed them, and here we have them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And they are only to be taken for what they are worth?

The CHAIRMAN: And they are to be taken only for what we know them to be. That has been said so many times I know it off by heart.

Mr. POULIOT: If the committee agrees, I will produce Bill E of the Senate in French as exhibit AA, completing exhibit A.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to produce it because it is public property, and any bill of the House of Commons or the Senate is a public bill and can be referred to without being put in.

Mr. POULIOT: I admit it is a public bill, but this is my copy and I give it to the committee as a gift in order to show my good will. I am sorry that the committee does not accept my gifts.

Mr. LAURIN: It is a liberal gift.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I always fear when the Greeks bring gifts.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not a Greek; I am a French Canadian.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, Mr. Patenaude, we will take exhibit B. Will you please look at exhibit B which is a report of the Board of Grain Commissioners and tell the committee if it is the only whole book, or nearly whole book, which has been produced by the Printing Bureau by photostat?—A. I see the date is October, 1931, and, naturally, that is before my being appointed King's Printer. I could not say about that.

Q. It is not that; but has it been copied by photostat at the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. I do not ask you about the translation. Now, I ask you about the production of it, and I ask you if it is the only book which has been copied by photostat, nearly in full, and produced by the Bureau to the committee?—A. I cannot answer that.

Q. Will you tell the committee if this book is nearly complete?—A. I cannot answer that.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let us ask the clerk if he has any other book which has been produced than that one; is that the only exhibit of that kind?

The CLERK: As far as I know.

Mr. POULIOT: Therefore, Mr. Patenaude, you do not know if this exhibit B is complete or not?

The WITNESS: No, I do not know.

Mr. POULIOT: Although it is apparently a 91-page book, class I index page, you do not know if it is complete or not?

Mr. MACINNIS: As an exhibit it must be complete. It is not necessarily complete as a photostatic copy.

Mr. POULIOT: I know that if you produce one page of a book that page is complete. I am not asking about the page, I am asking about the book in full.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You do not know whether there are any other pages except the pages which have been produced?—A. No.

Q. There may be some and there may not, we do not know.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Here is the Census of Canada, 8 pages in English and 8 pages in French. Have you personally seen those photostat copies which were brought here by by Mr. Shipman the other day?—A. I do not remember, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Pouliot, don't waste time.

Mr. POULIOT: I am just asking these questions of Mr. Patenaude in order to save time. I want to do things regularly.

Mr. BOWMAN: I consented fifteen or twenty minutes ago to your putting them in with a notation attached in any way you liked.

The CHAIRMAN: Be just, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. POULIOT: I wish to be just as just as any human being can be, Mr. Chairman, and you know it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Well then, why do you want to keep on referring to those?

Mr. POULIOT: Exhibit C, 8 pages in French of Census of Canada, 1931, and 8 pages in English, filed by common consent.

Mr. BOWMAN: With the notation, that the memoranda attached to these exhibits have been prepared by Mr. Pouliot, and have been attached to the exhibits by him.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a memoranda, it is a summary.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a memorandum just the same.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Patenaude, the pages that have been copied are from 866 to 873 in English, and from—

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Pouliot, your memoranda shows that. Why ask him about it?

Mr. POULIOT: I submit it is the only right way to do it.

Mr. BOWMAN: The only way the King's Printer can do that is to turn up the pages and confirm it.

Mr. POULIOT: I mean for the purpose of the record.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have already consented to the memorandum going in.

Mr. POULIOT: As to the number of pages?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, as to the number of pages, and as to the fact that the pages in English are exactly the same as the pages in French. It is on the record twice now. Why go all over it again.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Well, it is right this time.

The CHAIRMAN: It was right the first time.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Now, Mr. Patenaude, does what you have said about the Shipping Bill apply to the Census of Canada, 1931?—A. Well, in what way?

Q. In this way: To make it clear, I will have to tell you what I want to know. This is from page 866 to page 873 in English, and from page 890 to page 897 in French, and it means that there are at least 866 pages more than are here in English and 890 pages more in French, is that not so? You have only 16 pages here for both books.

Mr. BOWMAN: He has not said that these are the only pages of photo-static work that have been taken out of the book. He produces those and he says those are samples of the work that come to the bureau.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, but in order to deal fairly with the committee he should tell us if those are fair samples.

Mr. BOWMAN: He has already told us two or three times, Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, in connection with other exhibits but not this; this is the first time I have mentioned this exhibit.

Mr. BOWMAN: His evidence cover them all.

The CHAIRMAN: If you will look at the record of the previous sitting, Mr. Pouliot, you will find that Mr. Patenaude said that he did not care to express an opinion as to whether they were fair samples or not, and Mr. Shipman said they were fair samples.

Mr. POULIOT: That justifies my question to him.

The CHAIRMAN: No it does not. The witness has already told us, the previous day he was here, that he would not say whether that was a fair sample or not. On the other hand, Mr. Shipman said it was a fair sample.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, on account of that evidence all those exhibits should be thrown in the fireplace because they are worth nothing. If they are not a fair sample of the work of the galley proofs what is the use of them?

The CHAIRMAN: That is a matter for argument when we come to consider the Bill. At the present time we are taking evidence.

Mr. POULIOT: It is a most extraordinary thing, because the Secretary of State used those things in the House to show how much it was costing the country to run the printing bureau, and now we cannot ask the witness relevant questions about the very same matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Because the witness has already answered.

Mr. LAURIN: In the beginning the witness answered that these came from the printing bureau.

Mr. POULIOT: I am ready to admit that it does come from the printing bureau, but what I want to know is whether it is a fair sample or not.

The CHAIRMAN: This witness said the last time he was here he could not answer your question, therefore, he cannot tell you.

Mr. POULIOT: Therefore, these exhibits are of no value.

Mr. ERNST: That is a question for argument.

Mr. POULIOT: I want them checked in order that we can trace them back. I do not want anybody to come here and say it is this and that without seeing the number of pages. This is the first time it has been brought before the committee.

Mr. BOWMAN: Not at all.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, in comparison with the number of pages.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have asked for them to be put in, and now you tell us they are no good and that they are to be put in the file.

Mr. POULIOT: Just because I cannot get an explanation, and because the witness says he cannot give me a definite answer to my proper question.

Mr. MACINNIS: The reason for bringing these here is to show that there is some work done in the printing bureau. We are trying to obviate the continuation of producing bad work. It is just the same in connection with your criminal laws. You do not show up the average law-abiding citizen as a reason why you should have certain laws; you show up those who are breaking the laws.

Mr. CHEVRIER: You ought to find out about the fair proportion.

Mr. MACINNIS: Yes. It has been shown that there is considerable poor work done in the printing bureau.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Not yet.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, with due respect for the witness and for Mr. Shipman, we have to take the point of view that they are adverse. We have it from Mr. Patenaude in his evidence, as well as from Mr. Shipman, that they have had those proofs made in order to protect them. Protect them against whom? Protect them against the translators. I maintain that most of those mistakes are done by the translators; as we got it from Mr. Shipman the other day, it is the typesetters mistakes and sometimes the translators want to change a word. Well, that is all right. Mr. Shipman explained the other day that that was done in order to have more uniformity, but now we have something else. We have to take into consideration the fact that Mr. Shipman and Mr. Patenaude have had those photostat copies made in order to protect themselves against criticism that might come from the departments on account of the cost of translation. It is most important.

Mr. BOWMAN: These are matters of argument.

Mr. POULIOT: But I have to argue in connection with every question I have to put to the witness. It is tough.

Mr. BOWMAN: Not at all. You have asked these questions two or three times, and you have had every possible latitude, you must admit that.

Mr. POULIOT: I admit that you have been very generous to me, to a certain extent, but when I am just about ready to get the answer then something happens.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any more questions to be asked this witness?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Maybe those questions have been asked in a different way, but I gather, Mr. Patenaude, that you said that during the last ten years you have been making photostat copies of all the material that had been submitted to the bureau; did I understand you rightly?—A. Not all.

Q. Let us take ten years; did you say ten years?—A. Approximately, yes.

Q. Well now, in the last ten years what photostat copies have you been making in the printing bureau, what has been done, because you were not there; but in the last ten years particularly there has been some photostating done, is that right?—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. Now, of what copies?—A. Well, I am not prepared to say that. We have a stack of copies down at the bureau.

Q. I am satisfied to take your answer if you cannot say, but can you say for what purpose?—A. I have said before, for protection always, for the protection of the bureau.

Q. For the last ten years you have been photostating certain copies for the protection of the bureau?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are these photostat copies filed away?—A. Yes.

Q. And they would be available for the inspection of the committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For instance, with the leave of the Chairman, if I want to go down to the bureau I could go there and find out everything that has been photostated within the last ten years?—A. Yes, I am almost sure.

Q. You are almost sure?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, let me get this right: Did you make any selection for the production of those photostat copies?—A. We made no selection.

Q. No, no, did you make any selection?—A. I am not prepared to say.

Q. What I want to find out, Mr. Patenaude, is this: A large number of copies have been submitted to the committee; did you produce any of them yourself, did you bring them here?—A. No.

Q. Did you select them?—A. No.

Q. Do you know who did?—A. Well, I brought a couple of copies myself.

Q. You brought a few yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Let us deal with the ones you brought. Why did you select those?—A. Well, I selected the worst of them to show my minister that we were being criticized about the high charges, and I showed him the reason why.

Q. Now, you selected a few, but you did not produce any of the good ones?—A. We would not photostat good ones, naturally.

Q. Now then, can you tell me what proportion the bad copy that you have produced bears to the proportion of good translation that you did not produce?—A. Well, I cannot answer that.

The CHAIRMAN: That is all, thank you, Mr. Patenaude.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Just a minute, Mr. Patenaude. You have just tabled some excerpts. You produced, as Exhibit D, the report of the Auditor General, 1931, with the proofs of it?—A. Photostat copies.

Q. Yes, photostat copies?—A. Of a certain number of pages, not all.

Q. And on the photostat copies there is a reference to the page of the book and on the book there is a reference to the galley?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you produced as Exhibit E, photostat copies of the Hansard of the Senate of April 17, 1934, and also of November 19, 1932?—A. Yes.

Witness retired.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Pouliot asked the Clerk to request, Mr. Potvin, one of the Civil Service Commissioners, to attend here this morning, and the Clerk did so. As soon as this committee was appointed I communicated with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and asked him if he and the commission cared to appear before this committee to give us the views of the Civil Service Commission in respect of any matters which might arise, and if they would select one of their number to put forward their views. The Chairman advised me that all matters with reference to the Civil Service Commission and their views would be conveyed to this committee by Mr. Bland and that Mr. Bland would be their representative before this Committee. I, therefore, feel that unless there is some specific reason for calling Mr. Potvin we should not depart from that arrangement which was made with the Civil Service Commission and, therefore, I submit it for the committee's consideration before Mr. Potvin is called as a witness.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection at all. However, the Civil Service Commission is a public body. It is true that it is not responsible to government in the usual way; but I was no party to that undertaking, that the official views of the Civil Service Commission would be given by one of its members whoever he may be. It happens that up to the present we have had Mr. Bland who has dealt with these matters in a most satisfactory way. I am not responsible for calling Mr. Potvin, but I do not think that a committee of this kind, or a committee of the House, should be precluded from asking any one of its officials or employees, or anyone who is connected with the government, to come and give evidence. I do not know what this is all about, but I do not think it is right that we should, as members of this committee, be bound by a ruling or an understanding—to which I was no party in the first place—that we have not the right to call certain witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN: I have never even suggested you have not the right. I have not even suggested that anybody is bound. I merely submit it for the committee's consideration. Commissioner Bland has been expressing the views of the Civil Service Commission in pursuance of a letter to me, and in view of that fact I am submitting this matter for the consideration of the committee, unless there was some specific reason for calling Mr. Potvin.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have no reason whatever to call him.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pouliot, have you some reason for calling Mr. Potvin?

Mr. POULIOT: I have, Mr. Chairman, and I will explain it to you, although at times it is very embarrassing for me to tell the committee in advance what I am going to ask a witness. So long as the committee does not see the point that I am going to make then all right.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it in relation to the Translation Bill?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN: Call him.

Mr. POULIOT: Just a minute. I will be frank with you. I am going to ask him about Exhibit E which has been filed by Mr. Patenaude. Mr. Potvin is an authority on that because he was a translator for some time. It is on his own work.

Mr. BOWMAN: Are you calling Mr. Potvin to praise him for the good work he has done, or are you calling him to criticize him for poor work he has done?

Mr. POULIOT: I am just going to ask him questions about that, and I do not see why I cannot ask questions from a former translator.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand from you now that you want to call Mr. Potvin not in the capacity of a Civil Service Commissioner at all, but in connection with some translation work which he has done at some previous time.

Mr. POULIOT: I am going to ask him a few questions on account of the fact that he is one of the very few translators who have got promotion in the Civil Service.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. What is your pleasure gentlemen?

Mr. BOWMAN: I have no objection to him being called at all, except that it is not the duty of this committee to find fault with or praise any particular translator, because it has absolutely nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am in favour of letting the witness be called provided he is going to be examined on any matter that is relevant to the order of reference.

Mr. MACINNIS: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

ADRIEN POTVIN, called.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Will you please look at this Exhibit E, the first part, Hansard of Senate, November 9, 1932, and tell the committee if you made the translation and typed it.—A. I have to consult my notes.

Q. There are two parts. There are some photostat copies of Hansard of this year, and some photostat copies of Hansard of 1932. I am asking you only about 1932, galley 12-1 to galley 12-10.—A. What does that mean, galley 12?

Q. It means 12-1. You did not translate it?—A. No, that is not my work.

Q. Do you say that you did not translate it, or that you did not make the corrections on it?—A. No I did not. This is after I left.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. You just looked at the one sheet. Does that answer apply to all the rest? You might look at the rest and make sure your answer applies to all.—A. Do I understand rightly that this is Sitting Report No. 12, galley 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10; later on, it was on the 17th April, 1934; I wasn't there.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I do not want to quarrel with you, but there is an exhibit composed of a certain number of pages that have been submitted to you, and the question is asked of you: Is that a photostat copy of any portion of the work that you did?—A. No, that is not my writing.

Q. Look at those pages one by one. This is a photostat copy of some work that you performed, or it is not. Do you recognize that as a photostat copy of anything you did?—A. Not what I did.

Q. You had nothing to do with it?—A. Not so far; no, that is not my work.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Mr. Potvin, were you head translator of the Senate?—A. No.

Q. Were you a translator of the Senate?—A. No, I was editor and chief translator of the Senate Debates, and second clerk assistant.

Q. At what time did you leave that position?—A. On the 7th October.

Q. What year?—A. 1933.

Q. Last year?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you supposed to translate the Hansard of the session of 1932-33?—A. Was I supposed to?

Q. Yes, was it your duty to do it?—A. No. I was translating as the work was getting ready. When I left this was the work I had done; if it interests the committee.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You say "this," Mr. Potvin. I do not know what it is.—A. That is the report, when I left, of the work that had been done.

Q. As far as I am concerned, it will simplify matters considerably if I can get an answer to this question: Are there any photostat copies produced here of work done by you?

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Shipman, are there any photostat copies produced here of work done by Mr. Potvin?

MR. SHIPMAN: No, sir. I think what you have there is the only work.

MR. CHEVRIER: With which Mr. Potvin had nothing to do?

MR. SHIPMAN: Yes.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. I have another question to ask, Mr. Potvin. You are very familiar with the work of the Senate while the Senate is sitting?—A. Yes.

Q. And you know that a discussion about the League of Nations is most important?—A. I always considered it as such.

Q. Because it is a matter of international importance?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever correct proofs, Mr. Potvin, for printing?—A. Certainly. That was my work as editor.

Q. Well now, look at part of Exhibit A, the Senate debates of March 17th, 1934, photostat copies of Senator Dandurand's speech on the League of Nations. Will you please tell me if, on the average, it is a clean copy, and if there is good reason for the corrections that are made thereon?

Mr. BOWMAN: I question very much, Mr. Chairman, whether this has got anything to do with the matter at all.

The CHAIRMAN: So do I, but I thought it quicker to let it go rather than try to stop it.

The WITNESS: If it is an examination in translation I am quite prepared to pass it.

Mr. BOWMAN: The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that these corrections were made, so far as the printing bureau is concerned.

By the Chairman:

Q. I understand, Mr. Potvin, you would not care to answer that question without having ample time to examine the exhibit?—A. So far, I believe the corrections are justified.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. The corrections are fair?

Mr. ERNST: He says the corrections are justified.

The WITNESS: They are justified, I say. Of course there are so many here it would require some time to read them. Do you want me to read those? It will take about half an hour to read them.

The CHAIRMAN: No, we are not going to have the time of the committee taken up while you are reading.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. There is no photostatic copy of the translation of the Senate debates with which you had anything to do in your last year as an employee in that capacity in the Senate?—A. I do not know what is being done down there.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is what I want to get on to the record, Mr. Chairman. I want to find out if there is any photostatic copy of work which Mr. Potvin did as a translator in the Senate during his last year.

The CHAIRMAN: The answer is No. Mr. Shipman says No.

The WITNESS: You mean this last year?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. During last year and the year before.—A. No.

Q. None of that has been filed?—A. No.

Mr. ERNST: Mr. Shipman says No.

The WITNESS: I do not know. Of course, I say only this.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, Mr. Bland is here. Are there any further questions you want to ask in connection with the Translation Bill. If not, we will go to the consideration of the Bill itself.

Mr. POULIOT: I would like to have a copy of the letter that Mr. MacInnis had the other day.

Mr. MACINNIS: I had a letter in regard to author's corrections; it is in the secretary's file, I think.

F. G. BRONSKILL, called.

By the Chairman:

Q. Are you the accountant of the Printing Bureau?—A. I am the accountant of the Printing Bureau and representative of the Treasury.

Mr. BOWMAN: I suppose the latter office permits you to get all the money you like.

The CHAIRMAN: He is the watchdog of the Treasury .

Mr. MACINNIS: Who watches the watchdog?

Mr. POULIOT: On April 28, 1934, Mr. Patenaude, King's Printer, wrote to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission as follows—I will read that letter to you because you must be familiar with the figures therein.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think you need to read it, because he has a copy.

Mr. POULIOT: It is on record?

The CHAIRMAN: It is on record.

Mr. POULIOT: Only part of it.

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is there in full.

Mr. POULIOT: Will you tell me on what page?

The CHAIRMAN: I did not mean to say it is printed; it is filed.

Mr. POULIOT: It is referred to in the report; but it is not in the report.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the clerk points out that at page 158 it is printed in full.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, that is all right.

By Mr. Pouliot:

Q. Did you give the information to the King's Printer about that?—A. No, sir. I might explain that this information is obtained through the cost finding division of the department; it does not come under my sovereignty. We have an official, a technical officer and a statistical officer who makes up these figures, and these figures were made up by him out of his production and cost finding records.

Q. But you are familiar with these figures?—A. I am familiar in this respect, that I have a letter in front of me.

Q. Would it be possible for you to tell the committee the cost of author's alterations and the cost of typesetting due to errors in translation?—A. Well, I do not know quite why you refer to translation. So far as we are concerned, it is an author's alteration that is a change in the proof made by the author. The cost of that for the year 1933-34 is given at \$58,000.

Q. Yes. Well, it is pretty hard to tell how much of that money is due to translations—to French corrections or English corrections?—A. It would be very difficult.

Q. You say it would be very difficult?—A. Yes.

Q. And therefore, it is all put together?—A. Yes.

Q. Without knowing exactly what amount is due to the corrections of the French groups and the corrections of the English groups?—A. That is correct, sir.

Q. Has it not come to your knowledge that very often there are also mistakes of the typesetters which are corrected by the author?—A. They would be errors in typesetting which have been overlooked by the proofreader of the Printing Bureau?

Q. Yes.—A. Which would be noticed by the reviser—the author?

Q. Yes.—A. That might occur.

Q. But the proof is read first at the Printing Bureau and revised there?—

A. Yes.

Q. And that costs something, naturally?—A. Naturally.

Q. And is that charged to author's alterations or composition?—A. No, sir; it is charged to office corrections; it is included in the composition.

Q. And those author's alterations represent the cost of that revision at the Printing Bureau?—A. Yes.

Q. And that cost is charged to each department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Without any distinction with regard to French or English?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore, no one can say that that cost of author's alterations, \$58,000, is due to translation?

Mr. MACINNIS: To mistakes in translation?

The WITNESS: That is quite true. It must be taken together as both English and French.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you.

Witness dismissed.

The committee then proceeded to discuss the clauses of the bill.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 4 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, there are some members of parliament who want to be heard to-day.

Mr. D. B. PLUNKETT, M.P. (*Victoria*): Mr. Chairman, on March 15th I addressed a letter to you in reference to a communication and a resolution forwarded to me from the Britannia Branch of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League, Victoria, B.C. As I remember the outline of the resolution, it was asking that these returned men who were in the temporary employment service of the government might be retained and made permanent employees after five years service.

The temporary employment conditions in the Dominion service under which they are working at the present time is very unsatisfactory. There are men in the service who have been anywhere from ten to thirty years, and who are still temporary employees. In many cases they are holding positions which require greater responsibility than those who have been taken into the permanent service, and yet at the same time they are receiving lower wages. It seems almost impossible to remedy these things, and when a member is representing a constituency he is being continuously approached by someone asking for some redress. In the case of death, whatever moneys they may receive for their services, as a gratuity or a little extra to help out their families, has to be voted; and, in many cases nothing is voted, and after years of service they have nothing at all left to draw upon.

On the Coast there is the Department of Marine and Fisheries; temporary employees are all engaged in that service. Two years ago their holidays were cut off, and these men feel that they have not been treated properly for the reason that they are performing the same service as other civil service employees and have greater responsibility. Many of them are skippers of boats, mates, and other important positions and, as I say, even their holidays were cut off.

It is only natural to expect that those things will cause dissention in the civil service. These men feel that they are not being appreciated, and I think that some system should be inaugurated, even if they cannot be taken in under the present regulations, whereby they would have some certainty of relief, or some token of appreciation to show that their services had been valued.

I would suggest that where there are temporary employees that they be given, say, a \$100 gratuity for five years' service; \$200 for ten years' service, and so on up. That, of course, is my own suggestion, but I would leave that thought with the committee. For every year of service a stated sum could be given, so much per year according to the service, say that they allow them \$20 a year and they were six years in the service then they would get \$120.

These temporary employees are continuously calling upon me when I arrive home; I cannot do a thing; I cannot help them in any way and, in many cases, the only way in which they have been helped has been through generosity or by means of a compassionate allowance when voted, and yet they have all seen service. I know of one man, a janitor working in the post office at Victoria, who has been there for twenty-five years. He saw service in the South African war, but he cannot get advanced, he cannot be taken into the permanent service, but at the same time other people are being taken into the permanent service and are being paid more money for doing the same class of work.

I think I have outlined to the committee just what I would like to say, and as other members are going to speak it will not be necessary for me to take up the time of the committee any further. I would respectfully ask you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to give this matter your earnest consideration, particularly with regard to the returned men who have temporary positions.

The CHAIRMAN: Any questions, gentlemen? Thanks, Mr. Plunkett.

Mr. H. J. BARBER, M.P. (*Fraser Valley*): Mr. Chairman, Mr. Plunkett has mentioned employees in the Fisheries Department. We have temporary employees along the Fraser river who have been doing good work, and some of it very dangerous work.

It has developed in the last few years, that as soon as the civil service find that such a position exists they call for applications. I have in mind two men who have been in the service of the department for some twenty or twenty-five years.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask what kind of work that is?

Mr. BARBER: Fishery guardians along the Fraser River. They call for applicants for these particular positions. Those men that I have particularly in mind are over age and cannot apply, because they cannot come under the regulations, but some young men are put on in their place and they are shoved further up the river. I have discussed this matter with officials out there, and particularly with relation to those two men, and they claim that they have no power. They appreciate the service of these men; they are pleased with their work in the service and would very much dislike losing them. I understood there was some chance of a certain number of temporary employees being made permanent, and sometime ago I spoke to the officials of the Department and asked them if they would not approach the Civil Service Commission to see if these two men could not be taken in.

The CHAIRMAN: The obstacle in regard to that, Mr. Barber, is the age limit.

Mr. BARBER: Yes, but they have been in the employ of the civil service for twenty-five years at least, if not longer. One man by the name of Scott was up on that dangerous work at Hell's Gate where they were putting in those traps to have the salmon pass over, and while engaged in that work he was hurt and badly crippled. However, he is carrying on his work. The officials out there appreciate the service of this man Scott, as well as the other man that I have in mind, and they would like to see them brought in under the Civil Service Act.

Those are the facts I wish to lay before your committee to-day. These men are very valuable men, and the way that the Civil Service Commission is handling the system now it is only a matter of a short time before they will be turned out.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I ask you, Mr. Barber—because I think it may have something to do with superannuation—what would be the yearly salary of these men; would it be over \$600?

Mr. BARBER: Oh yes, it would be over \$600.

The CHAIRMAN: Your idea is, that some opportunity should be given these temporary employees to be blanketed into the service as permanent employees notwithstanding the fact that they are over the age limit set by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BARBER: Yes. They have been in the service of the Department for from twenty to thirty years.

The CHAIRMAN: There was an opportunity given, was there not, Mr. Bland, in 1924, for temporaries to come in?

Mr. BLAND: 1920 to 1927, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Well then, those men must have been of those who did not take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not think it was the men who did not take advantage.

Mr. BLAND: I think possibly there are many employees who would be considered by the committee at this time as long term temporaries who would have been eligible but who did not profit by the provisions of the orders in council of those years.

Mr. MACINNIS: There is a report on that; you have put in a report on the temporaries.

Mr. BLAND: It is partially available, Mr. MacInnis, and it will be completely available as soon as the committee desires to take it up again.

The CHAIRMAN: What are the names of those two men, Mr. Barber?

Mr. BARBER: Scott and Barker.

Mr. MACINNIS: So that if they were overlooked in the report we could have a special report.

Mr. BARBER: The officials out there are very anxious to retain them.

Mr. BLAND: I have made a note of that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you also make a note of the class of men Mr. Plunkett was speaking about, Mr. Bland?

Mr. BLAND: Yes, I will Mr. Chairman.

Mr. A. C. CASSELMAN, M.P. (*Grenville-Dundas*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the town of Prescott we have a marine depot which employs approximately sixty men. Now, I understand that previous to 1921 a large number of people employed by the government, who were not in the civil service, were blanketed in, but for some reason or other, in Prescott, these people were not given a chance to be blanketed in, and the result is that we have now, I would think, from thirty to thirty-five who are called long term temporaries.

The position of these people is that when they come to superannuation age they are simply dismissed from the service, and if they have been what you might call twelve-month men they are given one month's pay for each year of service.

The CHAIRMAN: As a gratuity.

Mr. CASSELMAN: As a gratuity, yes. Now, it turns out that some four months ago there were six people retired there who had service ranging from, I would think, four to twenty years. They were paid on that basis, with perhaps one or two exceptions. An exception was the steward-cook on the government steamer *Grenville*. That man had been in the employ of the department some eighteen years, I believe, but because of the fact that his service was only ten months a year he was not given any gratuity whatever. I think it is most unfair that that man should be placed in that position compared with the other men who received, some of them, a month's pay for four years service.

The CHAIRMAN: Why do you say he did not get any gratuity?

Mr. CASSELMAN: Because of the fact that the order in council did not cover him on account of him being a ten-month employee.

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Now, at the elevator at Prescott there are a large number of people who are in exactly the same position; they are temporaries; they are paid by the day instead of by the month, and they get no holidays—the same as those at the Marine works—and when a statutory holiday comes along they lose a day's pay.

The CHAIRMAN: They come under the class of all prevailing rate employees?

Mr. CASSELMAN: Yes, but my contention is this: These people, being in government service, are permanent employees and are entitled to have the advantage and the benefits which the Civil Service Act gives.

Th CHAIRMAN: Of course, Mr. Casselman, one of the reasons that the Civil Service Act contains for civil servants statutory provisions for holidays, sick leave, and superannuation, is because of the rate of pay they receive, but when you come to a prevailing rate employee he is receiving the prevailing rate of wages, and I presume, in the main, a higher rate of wages than he would be receiving as an ordinary regular civil servant. It is not easy to provide for that situation, to give him all the advantages of the other civil servants and yet, at the same time, to give him all the advantages that may be attendant upon being a prevailing rate employee.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Yes, but at that job at Prescott the prevailing rate employee is a lower paid man, as a rule, than the man who is receiving all the benefits under the Civil Service Act.

The CHAIRMAN: He is not like the carpenter or the bricklayer.

Mr. CASSELMAN: No. Then in addition to that, on the Williamsburg canal there are a number of people there, and this applies particularly to those who have been there the longest terms and do not receive the benefits that are received by those who happen to come in at the presnt time, or have come in within the last few years. It appears to me that these people have not been getting a deal commensurate to that given those who have come in in late years, and I would strongly urge upon the committee that consideration be given to this matter because I feel they have a well merited claim.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Casselman.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That has been one of my problems for the last thirteen years. I wish we could solve it.

Mr. CASSELMAN: Well I hope your committee will solve it.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shaver, do you want to make some representations.

Mr. F. T. SHAVER, M.P. (*Stormont*): My representations Mr. Chairman, are similar to those which have been presented by the three gentlemen who have already spoken.

There are on the Cornwall canal about twenty employees, lock motormen who are listed as temporary men; they are long service employees. I have one particular case in mind, a man who had written to me from time to time, and who has spoken to me personally; he has been there about nineteen years, and he holds the position of an assistant lockmaster. He is in charge of the lock, and yet he draws \$15 a month less pay than a man who was appointed in 1930 and who has no responsibility except to operate the lock under his direction.

Mr. MACINNIS: How do you account for that, Mr. Shaver?

Mr. SHAVER: He has always been listed as a temporary employee. I understand, according to information that I have, that an order in council was passed in December, 1920, which made it possible to blanket all canal employees into the permanent service; a further order in council, I understand, was passed later on; but, for some reason, they failed to grant permanent status to canal employees who had been appointed prior to November 15, 1919. This man and nineteen others were appointed prior to that date.

Mr. BLAND: That is another case of the difficulties that arise from the fact that some employees are temporary and other employees are permanent; temporary employees remain at the minimum whereas permanent employees are supposed to receive statutory increases, consequently one man who is practically responsible for the work may be getting \$15 less than another man who is doing precisely the same work but who has no responsibility.

Mr. SHAVER: There should be some way of remedying this, because no private corporation would run its business that way, that is, two men doing the same kind of work but one man with much more responsibility than the other and with longer experience but receiving less wages. It is absolutely unfair to those men, and they feel a great injustice has been done to them. I understand, when they had dependents they were given a yearly increase on account of those dependents which brought their salary up, approximately, to the same as the others. For instance, this man I mentioned in particular, had to support his mother, and he got an allowance during the years he supported his mother which brought his yearly income up nearly as much as the others. But his mother died and he had no one to support, and the allowance was immediately cut off, and with all the years of experience and the responsibility that he has he is drawing \$15 a month less than a man who has no responsibility and takes his instructions from this man. There are about twenty of these men. If you could do something to remedy this situation these men would be very grateful, and I think there should be some way of getting around it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is one case out of many hundreds that I know of, and something ought to be done to clean up that situation.

The CHAIRMAN: We are going to try to deal with it, Mr. Shaver.

Mr. SHAVER: I understand there are about 147 on the canals, and I suppose there are many others in other departments.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shaver.

Mr. SHAVER: Thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Neill M.P. also spoke to me, saying that he wanted to come before the committee. I have not been able to see Mr. Neill since the adjournment, but I would suggest we have Mr. Neill on Wednesday morning next at the opening before we hear from Mr. Phelan and the others. By the way, Mr. Bland, would you be good enough, if you have your report in

connection with the long term temporaries and the daily rate employees ready before next Wednesday, to have sufficient copies made so that each member of the committee will have one. Some of the members of the committee would like to have it so as to familarize themselves with it.

Mr. BLAND: Mr. Chairman, that has been tabled already, that is, as to long term temporaries, but I have purposely refrained from tabling the suggested recommendations of the commission, because I would prefer not to do that until the organizations have made their representations.

The CHAIRMAN: All we were interested in is in getting the record that is already in.

Mr. CASSELMAN: There is another difficulty at the elevator at Prescott, and that is the monthly men work on an 8-hour day, not a monthly salary; the men who are temporaries work on the basis of a 10-hour salary day, but they only receive an 8-hour pay, and they are not allowed overtime unless after they pass 10 hours. And they are not allowed overtime until after they pass ten hours. Now, it is my impression that government service requires an eight hour day; the regulations require an eight hour day, but in this particular case it seems to me that these men who are the long term temporaries have to go ten hours before they can get any work done and if they do work overtime then they really get nothing for it for the simple reason that if they do in four days 40 hours work I understand that they have to lay off one day. In other words, they rest. They are being paid for that, but they have done the work for which they are being paid in the previous four days.

The CHAIRMAN: That is they are paid for five days if they have done 40 hours work in four days.

The WITNESS: Yes. In other words, this is a way around the regulations. I know of no other class in the government service where the regulations are the same. Of course, it may be because of the fact that on that work the men are called in possibly at 9 o'clock at night to unload a boat, and that is the reason for it, but the situation is there and it does not appear to me to be a fair situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, next Wednesday morning, after hearing Mr. Neill, we might have Mr. Phelan of the Civil Service Federation of Canada, and Mr. Herwig of the Canadian Legion would like to be here at the same time as Mr. Phalen, and I have received a letter from Mr. Bowler of the Canadian Legion asking that General Ross might be heard, and I think that Wednesday was the date. He was to be in Ottawa on either the 9th or the 16th and as he comes from Western Canada we should try to convenience him, as much as possible. I would suggest that we notify Mr. Phelan for next Wednesday morning which will be the 16th, and if General Ross is here we will hear him as well.

Mr. BLAND: He will be here that day.

The CHAIRMAN: If we hear Mr. Phelan, General Ross and any other representative of the Canadian Legion I doubt if we will be able to hear Mr. Knowles of the Amalgamated Civil Servants on the same day. It might be well to notify him because we will have a four-hour session. We might put Mr. Phelan and General Ross at 11, and Mr. Knowles at 4. Now, then, each of these gentlemen of the Civil Service Federation and the Amalgamated Civil Servants at our request will endeavour to speak on behalf of these other branches of their association so we will not have to hear repetition of the same thing over and over.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Have we decided about some of these individual cases?

The CHAIRMAN: I understood what we were going to do with individual cases was maintain the attitude we did before that it is impossible for us as a committee to deal with individual complaints and that for the purpose of

dealing with them we suggested a tribunal which is available, and my information is that the tribunal has never yet actually functioned because all matters have been adjusted to the satisfaction of the civil servants' organization and the Commission without calling into effect this special tribunal. If a man has an individual complaint and his own civil service organization does not press for a tribunal or if he is not a member of an organization I think he can have his case heard by making application. I do not know why we should hear him if he does not take the matter to his organization.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am grateful for this explanation, because now the people will know what to do.

Mr. MACINNIS: There may be a specific complaint on a specific matter and another one arising out of a regulation of policy of a department. I think we might hear the first in order to make a recommendation on departmental policy.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I should think that anything that is a matter of policy we might deal with, but hardly with the individual case. There are five individual complaints, and my recollection is that not one of them deals with matters of policy. I suggest that each member of the committee get in touch with the clerk and look over the individual complaints, and if any member of the committee feels that any of the complaints deal with a matter of policy and that the committee ought to consider that case, we will deal with it.

The Committee adjourned to meet Wednesday, May 16, at 11 o'clock a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 8

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 1934

WITNESSES:

A. W. Neill, M.P.

V. C. Phelan, President, Civil Service Federation of Canada.

Brig. General Ross, Dominion President, Canadian Legion.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, May 16, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 A.M., Mr. Lawson presiding.

Members present, Messrs. Lawson, Laurin, Ernst, MacInnis, Chevrier, Pouliot and Bowman.

Mr. C. W. Bland, Civil Service Commissioner, in attendance.

CORRIGENDUM

(Omitted from Minutes of Proceedings of May 9.)

Re Bill No. 4, Clause 4.

Moved by Mr. Chevrier, that the word "proceedings" in the 6th line of clause 4, be struck out.

Motion lost.

Mr. A. W. Neill, M.P., appeared and made certain submissions. (See Minutes of Evidence hereto.)

Mr. C. V. Phelan, President of the Civil Service Federation of Canada, appeared on behalf of the Federation and the several affiliates who had separately submitted briefs. (See Minutes of Evidence hereto.)

Brigadier General Ross, Dominion President of the Canadian Legion, appeared on behalf of the Legion. (See Minutes of Evidence hereto.)

The Committee adjourned till Wednesday, May 23 at 11 A.M.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
May 16, 1934.

The Select Special Committee on Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. Lawson presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, shall we proceed?

Mr. POULIOT: At page 203 of the Minutes of Proceedings, number 7, Wednesday, May 9th, I am quoted as having said:—

I maintain that most of those mistakes are done by the translators; as we got it from Mr. Shipman the other day, it is the typesetters' mistakes and sometimes the translators want to change a word.

What I did say was:—

I maintain that most of those mistakes are not done by the translators; as we got it from Mr. Shipman the other day, it is the typesetters' mistakes and sometimes the translators want to change a word.

I have read the brief that Mr. Neill is going to read to the committee. Might I be permitted to say that I share Mr. Neill's views with regard to lighthouse keepers. I think also that the case of captains of lighthouses in the St. Lawrence river should be favourably considered by the committee.

Mr. MACINNIS: Before we proceed, Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw attention to an incorrect statement in last week's proceedings, on page 203. I am quoted as saying:—

The reason for bringing these here (that is, the photostats) is to show that there is some work done in the printing bureau. We are trying to obviate the continuation of producing bad work.

Then a little further down:—

It has been shown that there is considerable poor work done in the printing bureau.

That is not correct. If I said that, that was not my intention. The bad work was done by the translators and not the work of the printing bureau.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Mr. Neill, M.P., wishes to make some representations to the committee this morning.

Mr. A. W. NEILL, M.P. (*Comar-Alberni*): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the case is that of a few lighthouse keepers on the Pacific coast who have been refused their annual holiday unless they provide a qualified man to take their place at their own expense and with the understanding that the lighthouse keeper remains wholly responsible for anything happens in his absence. There is an exemption made in respect to one or two lighthouses which the department term "isolated," with which I will deal with later.

These people are civil servants appointed under the Civil Service Commission and subject to the Civil Service Act which says that they shall be entitled to three weeks holidays each year. The only restriction imposed is that they shall take their holidays at the time of the year allotted them by the deputy minister. At first there was uncertainty as to the status of these lighthouse keepers, but some six or seven years ago it was agreed that they were civil ser-

vants and entitled to civil servants' holidays. For some two or three years they received them, a substitute being provided by the department and paid by it.

Last year, and possibly part of 1932, the department took the stand that they would not provide and pay a substitute to any of the stations except those they regarded as isolated, which cut out nearly all the stations on the Pacific coast. There is no justification whatever for such a decision. Are the holidays of the thousands of civil servants engaged in Ottawa and elsewhere decided on the basis of whether their location is isolated or not? If so, how many would get holidays?

Let me give you some illustrations of stations which the department claims are not isolated—and that means about 98 per cent.

There is one eleven miles over an unspeakable trail to a small settlement at which point a steamer calls three times a month.

Another one seven miles, also over a poor trail, to a small settlement, store, etc., where steamers call about twice a week, but for the most part traffic has to be done by water when the weather permits. Let me quote what the man living there says:—

. . . the last I asked for was three years ago. Also kindly note conditions on which I may have leave. I wish to state by government road it is seven miles one way to P.C. and store, it is by road, I have to go in winter a walk of fourteen miles. In summer I go by boat, driven by an outboard motor, supplied by myself, taking a boat three hours there and back; all supplies are received by water route, weather permitting. Also owing to the distance, of the school, I must employ a school teacher for my daughter. Should I require the services of a doctor from Campbell River he would have to cross to the Cove, then by car to the joyces, then around by beach to station. This I also would have to pay for, launch hire, also the car. Does not the above place the station in an isolated condition . . .

Another one about 8 miles to a landing place where the steamer calls three times a month, at rather uncertain intervals. It would then take two or three days for the steamer to reach any town, such as Victoria or Vancouver, so that even if the three weeks is granted a large proportion of it is lost in going and coming.

Is it suggested that a man and his wife, living utterly alone in a lighthouse for twelve months, perhaps seeing no one else for long intervals—perhaps months at a time—are not entitled to a change once a year? The records of our lunatic asylums show that the doctors and even attendants are compelled to take an annual holiday.

Now, under the conditions imposed, a substitute must be employed who is qualified for the work. In these out-of-the-way places you cannot pick up a man to run the somewhat complicated machinery of the light and fog alarm, and possibly a man would have to be brought from Victoria or Vancouver and his transportation paid both ways. The expense would be far out of proportion to the lightkeeper's ability to pay; he would have to lose not only his own three weeks' salary, but the cost to him would be equivalent to about two months' salary. Let me quote you from a letter which I have received:—

This year I shall be unable to afford a holiday, unless the department does the square thing, and pays the above and this year's cost of relief.

Then again, the lighthouse keeper has to be responsible for any damage if this substitute, with whom he may have no acquaintance, makes some mistake. He may come back to find himself suspended because of a mistake of this substitute. This is neither fair nor reasonable.

Apart from the very obvious need for these people to have an annual holiday—I will forget all that and not ask for any special privilege, as is so often done before committees such as this—it is not a case of that, it is a case of asking that they be treated just in the same way as other civil servants in Ottawa and other sections are treated.

Now, the whole trouble arises from a desire of the department to save a few dollars. The principle on which they go—although they dare not say so openly—is that they will give holidays only to civil servants where it does not cost them anything to supply a substitute; that is to say, in an office in Ottawa where there are five people and four can carry on the work; whereas if there is only one lighthouse keeper the work cannot be carried on without a substitute. That is not the principle of the Civil Service Act, however, which allows to one and all an annual leave. The expense would not be tremendous, because, by a little management, one man on the Pacific Coast could do it all by arranging that each lighthouse keeper should take his leave in turn, and the department could have a competent man on hand to replace the keeper when on leave.

Take other departments, such as the telegraph service, in a locality where they have some local person who is qualified to do the work, that person is put on and paid, which saves travelling expenses. In other cases the department has a permanent relief man who goes around to the various stations in turn.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Who appoints the substitutes?

Mr. NEILL: The department. The man pays the relief himself, but he has to get the approval and, as I say, the probability is that he has no acquaintanceship with him at all, does not know him, and the chances are that he may be a man who never saw a lighthouse but he says he understands an internal combustion engine. Anything may go wrong; the substitute may get drunk, and when the lighthouse keeper goes home he may find himself suspended or fired on account of some irregularity.

Mr. BOWMAN: How many lighthouse keepers are there in this class, Mr. Neill?

Mr. NEILL: I have the list here. I suppose there are two or three dozen in my district.

Mr. ERNST: How many would there be on the whole coast?

Mr. NEILL: Oh, perhaps sixty or seventy, something like that.

Mr. ERNST: You would have to apply it to the Atlantic Coast as well where the conditions are identical.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, where the conditions were similar. If Mr. Hanson, of Skeena, were here I feel sure he would concur in all I have said because a lot of these lighthouses apply to his district too. That is all I wanted to say on that subject, but I have two other matters that I would like to bring out, not individual cases but classes, and they will only take me a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Just while you are on that, Mr. Neill, may I ask Mr. Bland, are the holidays of these men covered by the general provisions under the regulations for leave of absence?

Mr. BLAND: The question of annual leave is covered by the provisions of the Civil Service Act itself.

The CHAIRMAN: Does that not give them a statutory right to three weeks holiday each year?

Mr. BLAND: Except as Mr. Neill has pointed out the provision includes the word "may"; but it is quite true, that generally speaking, that is a comprehensive provision.

The CHAIRMAN: And these restrictions which Mr. Neill has outlined—and to which these men are subject—are departmental?

Mr. BLAND: Entirely.

The CHAIRMAN: Not the Commission?

Mr. BLAND: Oh no.

Mr. NEILL: By the way, I know that this will be met by saying that it is not so, that each case is regarded on its own basis and with sympathetic soul. It is not so, Mr. Chairman, and here is the evidence over the signature of Colonel Wilby, agent of the Department of Marine; this is what he writes to one of these men who asked for leave:

I now have to advise that the department have ruled that your station cannot be regarded as an isolated one, therefore the regulations regarding leave for lightkeepers do not apply to your case. If, however, you care to make application subject to the usual conditions, namely, that you make your own arrangements for the proper care and maintenance of the station during your absence and assume responsibility for the station during your absence the department will consider same.

No question about that, no case by case on its merits there, is there; that is the standard rule.

Mr. BOWMAN: Have you discussed the matter with the Deputy of the Department?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, I have had it up with the department until I am tired.

The CHAIRMAN: You will realize, Mr. Neill, that the most this committee could do—unless they see fit to make some amendment to the statute—would be to recommend to the department that this whole matter be considered with a view to putting lighthouse keepers on some equivalent basis so far as holidays are concerned with other civil servants who are situated elsewhere.

Mr. NEILL: Well, pardon me, my suggestion is not that. All I am asking is that the Act be enforced.

The CHAIRMAN: You see, the section includes the words "may grant leave."

Mr. NEILL: I would like to ask Mr. Bland if there is a case on record where it has happened they have made use of the word "may."

The CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what is being done in this case, Mr. Neill.

Mr. NEILL: They just simply say "We have made the ruling."

The CHAIRMAN: But they cannot make recommendations except within the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and because the Civil Service Act says "may" then they make a ruling. Therefore, I say, is not the most we can do—unless it is desired to amend the Act—to recommend to the department that consideration be given these men so that they may be placed in an equivalent position so far as holidays are concerned with other civil servants?

Mr. NEILL: That is all I can ask.

Mr. MACINNIS: I do not think the Act allows discrimination only it says "may."

Mr. CHEVRIER: In the 1923 report I think that question was brought up then, about leave of absence for isolated cases. We discussed it at that time.

Mr. BLAND: I was just going to quote the section of the regulations that bears on the matter. Section 75 was drafted to provide for such a case as this to which Mr. Neill refers, and it reads:

Vacation leave must be taken during the year in which it is earned, except in the case of employees in outlying districts where the geographical conditions render it impossible to take leave each year, in which case it may be allowed to accumulate until such time as the department is prepared to allow the full amount to be taken. Exception may also be made

in cases where the exigencies of the public service have made it impossible or inexpedient for the department to grant annual leave to an employee. In such cases the deputy head shall request the employee in writing to forego his leave for one year, and shall give him authority to carry all or a portion of said leave over to the next fiscal year, but the leave carried over must be taken in the succeeding year together with the leave for the year to which it has been transferred; providing that if, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission, certain cases merit more generous treatment, provision therefor may be made by the governor general in council on the recommendation of the commission.

Indicating that the contingency that Mr. Neill outlines arises, and provision is made for it by this section of the regulation.

Mr. NEILL: Well, that section 75 shows that they are entitled because it makes regulation for accumulation, but it does not say a thing about providing for a substitute and paying for him and being responsible.

Mr. ERNST: I have great sympathy with your request, Mr. Neill, but it does look to me difficult to comply with. Take your own district, it is quite simple, but when you have to take every lighthouse in Canada that means you would have practically to regiment your keepers with regard to leave, and I can quite conceive that many lighthouse keepers would not want to take their leave in winter.

Mr. NEILL: They are all subject to that: they must take their leave to fit in. Anyway, that is better than not getting any at all.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think they would rather be regimented rather than not get any holidays.

Mr. ERNST: You would have to have considerable staff.

Mr. NEILL: Some people prefer the winter time. It could be regulated.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I would rather take time to look the Act up and then the regulations, and probably we could discuss that.

The CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to do is to get a picture of the situation before the committee.

Mr. NEILL: May I ask Mr. Bland, is there any regulation saying that a lighthouse keeper shall have to supply a substitute and pay him.

Mr. BLAND: That is a matter of departmental policy.

The CHAIRMAN: When you were speaking, Mr. Neill, I was glancing at the regulations passed by the Civil Service Commission to ascertain if that was covered by regulation of the commission. That is why I asked Mr. Bland.

Mr. NEILL: The other thing I have is a short one, but it is along the same line.

Telegraph agents have been for a number of years asking to be put under the superannuation act. They are civil servants in every respect, but for some weird reason they are classified as current wage employees on the theory that their pay goes up and down according to the wages paid from time to time to telegraphers. That is, however, not so. They are paid a yearly sum, fixed, and paid monthly. This matter has been before the government for years, but as the telegraph agents are few in number it has been more or less sidetracked. A committee was appointed in the time of the late government composed of departmental officials, some of the civil servants, and Mr. Knowles, who is a representative of the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada. The matter was approaching a satisfactory settlement when the change of government took place, and the depression broke it up.

I would suggest that the matter be looked into by this committee, and, if approved, a recommendation to that effect be sent to the government.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Neill, for your information, the special committee has never previously considered prevailing rate employees, but that is one of the subjects we are going to consider.

Mr. NEILL: Well, just one other matter along the same lines. The captains and officers on these government ships on the Pacific are not given their holidays. They used to be given their holidays the same as any other department, and the same as any other ship; and there is some kind of a theory—I do not know whether it is expressed in the regulations—that where the rules of the Civil Service do not govern, the rules or custom of the trade shall govern; and the custom of the shipping industry on the Pacific coast is to give them holidays.

Mr. ERNST: They are not under the Civil Service, are they?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, they are in the service; they are under the Marine Department.

Mr. ERNST: Your captains are civil servants in the Marine? I would be surprised if they are; they are not in the east.

Mr. NEILL: They are under the regulations; they got holidays for years.

Mr. ERNST: I do not think there is anything we can do about that. All those captains and crews on government boats are entirely outside the service.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question about that.

Mr. NEILL: I was told that the auditor general objected to these men getting holidays. There is a misunderstanding on the behalf of the department. They say they cannot grant these men holidays because of the objection of the auditor general. He did not object. What he did object to was giving it under the existing regulation, and his suggestion was that they should change the regulation.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless they are civil servants—there is only one matter in respect to that which this committee is competent to consider, and that is whether or not they should be made civil servants. If they are outside the service there is nothing we can do about it except to consider as to whether they should be brought in or not.

Mr. NEILL: Is your committee not qualified to deal with any civil servants?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. NEILL: Only under the Act?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Otherwise, you see, it is purely departmental.

Mr. NEILL: Well then, for the sake of clearness, I will end up by saying the department instead of changing the regulation try to evade it. I believe in justice being done to all, and I would suggest that they be asked to make a ruling particularly if we are going to have capable and loyal captains and mates on these boats. We should treat them as the C.P.R. or any other company would treat them.

While I am here, I may say I agree entirely with the remarks made at the last meeting by the members who spoke—Mr. Plunkett, Mr. Barber, Mr. Casselman and Mr. Shaver, regarding permanent temporaries. I know of a woman who has worked for thirty-four years and if she becomes disabled she will be thrown out of employment, yet she has been a temporary permanent all these years.

The CHAIRMAN: That is another problem we are going to consider, Mr. Neill.

V. C. PHELAN called.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, just before Mr. Phelan starts, I had a memorandum handed to me this morning with reference to temporary employees from the Dominion Public Works Association, and there are copies here for all members of the committee. And then, gentlemen, the librarians of the different departments are desirous of making some submissions to the committee. I have checked them over sufficiently to satisfy myself that the problem is really quite distinct from that of the Professional Institute problem, of which they are an associate member, or something of that kind; and they have supplied me with sufficient copies of a brief or memorandum here so that each member of the committee will have one, and Miss Grace Hart, the librarian in the Department of External Affairs, is desirous of making some submissions to the committee, and I suggest that we might hear Miss Hart after we hear the other organizations that we have arranged for now.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is quite satisfactory to me, Mr. Chairman, but this memorandum that has just been distributed on behalf of the Dominion Public Works Association, I suppose that will be filed and made a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN: I am having it filed, but I am not having the reporter put it in as part of the record yet.

Now gentlemen, we had arranged to have Mr. Phelan. Mr. Phelan is the president of the Civil Service Federation of Canada. The Federation includes the following organizations:—

Ottawa Elevators Operators.

Canadian Federal Grain Employees Association.

Grain Board Employees.

Federated Association of Letter Carriers.

United Post Office Employees.

Ex-employees, Public Works Association, Ottawa.

- Watchmen, Public Works Department, Ottawa.

Foremen and Assistant Foreman, Public Works Department, Ottawa.

I think that covers the list.

The WITNESS: Those are the organizations which have sent in memoranda and otherwise wish to have matters brought to the attention of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The list I have read are those that have sent in memoranda to the committee and desire consideration, and Mr. Phelan has filed a list of the affiliated organizations of the Civil Servants Federation.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Are there any copies available for the members of the committee of those who have submitted memoranda, or should we just take it from Mr. Phelan's memorandum itself?

The CHAIRMAN: All those I have mentioned have submitted briefs.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And are copies of them available?

The CHAIRMAN: No, they have not been made but we can have them made if you desire. Some of them are merely letters.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It might save a lot of time if we had copies of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Phelan has gone over them and is going to present the pith of them to this committee, as I understand it, as part of his submissions. I believe you have prepared a statement, Mr. Phelan.

The WITNESS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE CIVIL SERVICE FEDERATION OF CANADA IN REFERENCE TO THE STATUS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE DIRECTOR OF SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

To the Chairman and Members of the Parliamentary Committee on Civil Service.

GENTLEMEN,—As President of the Civil Service Federation it is my duty and pleasure to submit representations to you in support of the application which has been made by the Staff of Soldier Settlement of Canada to be extended the benefits of the Superannuation Act 1924 and amendments thereto and to be included in the permanent Civil Service of Canada.

I submit the following reasons why the staff of the Department should be included in the Permanent Service and extended the benefits of the Superannuation Act:—

I. Many members of the staff have performed up to 15 years continuous, useful, public service not including war service.

II. The of the Department must continue for at least another 20 years on the basis of specific land settlement contracts between the Department and settlers under its jurisdiction.

III. The Department was reorganized in 1931 and has been reported to Parliament as now being on an efficient business basis with reasonable administration cost. (Reference Hansard, pages 5049 and 5100 May 8th and 9th, 1933).

IV. The merits of our claim for superannuation have been publicly referred to by the Rt. Honourable the Prime Minister. (Reference Hansard, page 3129, May 14th, 1928).

The following information is furnished with respect to the Organization and nature of the work performed.

STAFF

This petition concerns a staff of 343 temporary employees, 251 of whom are males and 92 females. Ninety-eight per cent of the male staff are returned soldiers.

Sixty-two members of the staff are located at Head Office, Ottawa. Two hundred and eighty-one are attached to District Offices throughout the Dominion; of this number ninety-nine are fieldmen located throughout the Dominion at strategic points in the territory for which they are responsible. Seventeen members of Head Office Accounts staff were made permanent last year as part of the Treasury Staff.

The following table shows staff distribution:—

	Male	Female	Total
Head Office	41	21	62
Vancouver	30	8	38
Calgary	28	8	36
Edmonton	34	13	47
Saskatoon	46	15	61
Winnipeg	25	10	35
Toronto	22	7	29
Sherbrooke	4	2	6
St. John	21	8	29
	251	92	343

Reorganization of the Soldier Settlement Department in 1931 resulted in retirement of 158 of the then personnel; salary cost reduction \$270,264 and the closing of three District Offices. The Organization may now fairly be said to be on a permanent basis.

ADMINISTRATION COST

The Honourable W. A. Gordon, Minister of the Department, in dealing with administration cost of Soldier Settlement before Parliament last year stated as follows:—

“To-day the cost of administration is less than one per cent (of the net investment) which compares very favourably with the cost of administration of loan companies similar business.”

(Reference Hansard May 9th, 1933, page 5100).

SCOPE OF WORK

The Soldier Settlement Department conducts the work of Soldier Land Settlement under the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919 and amendments, and General Land Settlement as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. The two activities are complementary.

The value of these two phases of work being performed by one organization was brought out in report of the Board of Audit, October 1st, 1929, page 21, under “Recommendation”:—

- (a) Resulting from our survey of the activities of the board, we have come to the conclusion that the interests of the Dominion and the ultimate realization upon its investment of over \$55,000,000 in loans and properties, will necessitate for some years, the exercise of sound judgment and careful attention to collections. The Dominion has in the Settlement organization a staff with a practical working knowledge of conditions throughout the country. As work in connection with the Soldier Settlement loans decreases every effort should be made to use this organization in the general colonization work of the Dominion.

EXTENT OF WORK

(a) *Soldier and British Family Settlement.*

At this date there are 22,095 farm properties under the administration of the department representing a net public investment of \$57,100,376.31 inclusive of British Family Settlement loans.

There are:—

11,205 soldier settlers whose contracts continue until the year 1947.

5,650 “civilian settlers” (i.e., purchasers of reverted Soldier Settlement farms) whose contracts continue up to 1959.

2,182 British family settlers whose contracts extend to 1955.

There is a total of 19,037 active loans and 3,058 farms on hand for resettlement or resale.

The current accounts of settlers are covered by individual land contracts which run for a period of 25 years during which time as settlers repay their loans or as they transfer, or assign their interest, deeds, conveyances and assignments have to be drawn, approved and executed; foreclosed properties have to be resold; insurance to the extent of \$19,000,000 on farm buildings has to be carried and renewed, and security covering the entire indebtedness has to be preserved.

Work similar to that of a mortgage or lending institution has to be undertaken in connection with the administration of this public estate. The work is divided into three departments: accounting, estates and securities, and field supervision.

In addition to necessary supervision furnished backward settlers, the field staff is required by specific agreements with the British Government to render field supervision service to British family settlers under the Three Thousand British Family Agreement and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Scheme.

(b) General Land Settlement.

The evolution of the Soldier Settlement staff from a purely Soldier Settlement organization to its present position wherein it administers Soldier Settlement and General Land Settlement as the colonization arm of the Department of the Department of Immigration and Colonization has been gradual. Each successive step in the field of general colonization has been necessitated by actual settlement demands for practical services of a character the department is equipped to give.

Under Orders in Council P.C. 1645, August 17th, 1923; P.C. 320, March 14th, 1927; and P.C. 698, April 14th, 1927, the administration of the Soldier Settlement Act was transferred from the Minister of the Interior and placed under the Minister of Immigration and Colonization and provision made that Soldier Settlement staff or such portion of the staff as the ministry may from time to time determine shall be designated as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Prior to 1923 the Department of Immigration and Colonization had no Land Settlement service and, therefore, existed in name only in so far as actual settlement activities were concerned.

As an indication of the work coming under the heading "General Land Settlement," the Land Settlement Branch has placed in farm employment 66,494 persons from January 1st, 1924, to December 31st, 1933.

Special reference is made to the work of the staff in connection with the Back-to-the-Land Movement instituted by the Government in the autumn of 1930. This work has taken the form of a co-ordinated effort between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Colonization Departments of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. In the period October 1st, 1930, to December 31st, 1933, a total of 94,092 persons have been absorbed into agricultural life by the three agencies mentioned, and of this number the Land Settlement Branch was directly responsible for the settlement and placement of 21,427 persons.

In May, 1932, the Federal Government entered into agreement with eight Provincial Governments for settlement of land of qualified unemployed families—the Relief Settlement Plan—under which 2,701 families, including 14,358 persons, have already been settled. On the recommendation of Provincial Governments the Agreements are being extended for a further two years. The Soldier Settlement staff has taken an active part in this work in all provinces. Clause 6 of the Dominion, Provincial Agreements reads as follows:—

The Province shall set up an Advisory Committee upon which shall be included representatives of the Dominion Land Settlement Branch, the Colonization Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Colonization Branch of the Canadian National Railways.

(c) Services to Other Departments

In recent years this organization has carried out rural investigations for the following Dominion Government departments:—

- (1) Department of Pensions and National Health (Relief to war pensioners).
- (2) The War Veterans Allowance Committee (Allowances to disabled veterans not eligible for pension).
- (3) The Board of Pension Commissioners (Special reports as required).
- (4) Department of Interior (Patents to soldier settler holders of Dominion land).

The number of investigations conducted for other Departments in 1932 totalled 7,110 and in 1933 the total was 6,511.

In conclusion it is submitted:—

- (a) That substantial work in Soldier Settlement must continue during the period of Soldier Settlement Agreements and Civilian Settlers' Land Agreements until the years 1947-1959.

- (b) That substantial general land settlement and colonization commitments have been entered into with the British Government under the Three Thousand British Family and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Agreements which, as above indicated, require the services of a staff until 1955. The services of the Land Settlement Branch are required to perform the work of general colonization and settlement described.
- (c) That our usefulness as a service department has been established in connection with the rural investigations aforementioned, and that because of the saving which has obviously been made to the public treasury, such activities will doubtless be continued for many years to come.

In addition to the above considerations the staff of the Soldier Settlement of Canada urge that it be borne in mind that most of the staff have already been employed up to fifteen years and feel that they are justly entitled to some measure of consideration for their long period of faithful service.

AGES OF SOLDIER SETTLEMENT STAFF

Office	Under 30		30's		40's		50's		60's		Totals	
	M.	E.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
Head Office.....		8	8	5	18	6	11	2	4		41	21
Vancouver.....		2	2	3	17	3	10		1		30	8
Edmonton.....	1	6	6	4	13	2	11		4		35	12
Calgary.....		3	3	3	17	1	6	1	2		28	8
Saskatoon.....		4	5	5	27	5	9	1	5		46	15
Winnipeg.....		2	4	4	13	3	6	1	2		25	10
Toronto.....		2	3	3	17	2	2				22	7
Sherbrooke.....		1	2		2	1					4	2
Saint John.....		3	7	4	13			1	1		21	8
Totals.....	1	31	40	31	137	23	55	6	19		252	91

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT STAFF PARTICULARS AS TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT

	15 years or more (appointed prior to 10-11-19)	13 to 14 years	11 to 12 years	9 to 10 years	6 to 8 years	5 years or less	Totals	
							Male	Female
Head Office—Male.....	30	6				5	41	
Female.....	9	1			7	4		21
Vancouver—Male.....	13	13	2		2		30	
Female.....		1	1	2	1	3		8
Calgary—Male.....	6	10	1	1	7	3	28	
Female.....	3	1	1		3			8
Edmonton—Male.....	16	9	2		8		35	
Female.....	1	1	2	3	4	1		12
Saskatoon—Male.....	17	15			10	4	46	
Female.....	1	3	4	5	1	1		15
Winnipeg—Male.....	11	6	1		3	4	25	
Female.....	2	1	4	1	1	1		10
Toronto—Male.....	3	11	1	1	4	2	22	
Female.....		1			4	2		7
Sherbrooke—Male.....	1	1			1	1	4	
Female.....		1				1		2
St. John—Male.....	2	7	1	2	5	4	21	
Female.....		1	1		4	2		8
Totals—Male.....	99	78	8	4	40	23	252	
Female.....	16	11	13	11	25	15		91

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we have several matters that we would like to bring to the attention of this committee. Some of them are fairly general in their scope, while some others refer only to the employees of one class or one department.

I might say, that since the appointment of the Committee by the House of Commons was announced, we have received a great many requests from different branches of the Civil Service to have matters brought to the attention of the committee, and those we have sorted over, and we have ruled out a good many which, judging by the proceedings of the committee to date, the committee would not be particularly interested in, or would not feel that it should deal with.

The first matter that we would like to bring to the attention of the committee is that affecting the status of the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board.

The question of long term temporaries, I believe, has been frequently mentioned before this committee, and while in some respects the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board consists of long term temporaries there are some differences between the case of these employees and the case of the typical long term temporary. These employees are temporary, and at the present time are held to be exempt from the operations of the Civil Service Act. Were it not for a series of orders in council passed at intervals over a period of about fifty years, these employees would today be under the Civil Service Act, and presumably, in most cases, would be permanent; but due to certain reasons orders in council were passed at intervals, with the result that the employees are not under the operations of the Civil Service Act, and consequently are of a temporary status.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Would you summarize those reasons.—A. The chief reason, and I presume the sole reason, was that when the Soldier Settlement Board was first established it was rather assumed that its work would not be of a continuing nature, that there would come the day perhaps in the reasonably near future when it would be possible to discontinue the work of the board. As time has gone along, however, the work of the board has continued. While there has been some curtailment with the passing of the years, the fact is that today the board still has a great deal of work to do, and prospectively a great deal of work to do in the future with respect to soldier settlers as well, of course, as to some other matters or settlement which have been assigned to the board from time to time. But I think it was chiefly because of the fact that it was thought that the board would come, within say ten or fifteen years, to the time when it could be abolished, and it was thought advisable that the staff should not be made permanent at the outset.

Q. What has been the maximum, and what is it at the present time?—A. I do not know exactly what the maximum was, but in 1931 the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board was reorganized and reduced at that time; the staff was reduced by 158, leaving, as at the present time, a total staff of 343. My recollection is, that the maximum staff of the Soldier Settlement Board at any one time was round about 700. Up to 1931 it was about 500, and today it is down to about 343.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. What year was it instituted?—A. Under legislation enacted in 1919, but I believe there was some settlement board even prior to that time, under some different legislation I assume.

Q. Have you got the numbers of the orders in council affecting that? If you have them, I would like to have the numbers.—A. I have a whole series of orders in council here.

Q. I am only interested in having the numbers now.—A. Would it be all right if I gave them to you afterwards?

Q. Well, if the committee is not interested in the orders in council, if you will just give me a list of the numbers.

The CHAIRMAN: You will find them all set out at pages 909 of the 1932 proceedings of the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Unless there are some subsequent to that date.

The WITNESS: There was one passed as recently as the 31st January, 1934.

Mr. CHEVRIER: These would only up to 1932, Mr. Chairman.

By the Chairman:

Q. Will you give me the number of that one in 1934?—A. P.C. 306/193. That is the most recent one continuing the exemption.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Those figures you have just given us, Mr. Phelan, that is really a reduction of over 50 per cent?—A. From the peak. I am guessing as to what the peak was when I say 700. That is my offhand recollection of it. I do not positively say that that is the correct number. From that there was a reduction made in 1931 of 158, which would be a reduction at that time of about—

Q. Pretty nearly 30 per cent?—A. Around 30 per cent at that time.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What happened these employees that were let out in 1931?—A. Well, they were just released, and as they were not under the Civil Service Superannuation Act they were paid a gratuity graded upon the basis of length of service. I think in cases where they had been in over 5 years they were given one month's pay for each two years of service, and where they had been in less than five years they were given, I think, a month's pay.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. That is really the crux of the problem, is it not, the question of whether or not they can be really permanently employed in the Civil Service?—A. That is the crux, whether the work will continue.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is there anybody who can say just what the nature of that work is and the likelihood of it continuing?—A. I could read a section from the memorandum, if I may, just bearing on that point:

EXTENT OF WORK

(a) *Soldier and British Family Settlement.*

At this date there are 22,095 farm properties under the administration of the Department representing a net public investment of \$57,100,376.31 inclusive of British Family Settlement loans.

There are:—

11,205 soldier settlers whose contracts continue until the year 1947.

5,650 "Civilian settlers" (i.e., purchasers of reverted Soldier Settlement farms) whose contracts continue up to 1959.

2,182 British family settlers whose contracts extend to 1955.

There is a total of 19,039 active loans and 3,058 farms on hand for resettlement or resale.

The current accounts of settlers are covered by individual land contracts which run for a period of 25 years during which time as settlers repay their loans or as they transfer, or assign their interest, deeds, conveyances and assignments have to be drawn, approved and executed; foreclosed properties have to be resold; insurance to the extent of \$19,000,000 on farm buildings has to be carried and renewed, and security covering the entire indebtedness has to be preserved.

Then during the years immediately preceding the time when immigration was drastically curtailed certain civilian land settlement work was turned over to the Soldier Settlement Board. That was done, as has been referred to, partly in line with the recommendation of the Soldier Settlement Board of date of October 1, 1929.

At the present time, many of the staff have had about 15 years' service. These contracts have a maximum of 25 years to run. During the course of the next 25 years the staff of the board would be reduced through natural causes quite heavily. That might be anticipated with a good deal of confidence, and owing to the fact that the staff of the board is not being appointed to-day but was appointed, in many cases, 15 years ago, and in other cases years ago running up to 15. Even if it be assumed that the work would terminate 25 years hence, there would be very few, if any, of the present staff left in the service by that time. At entrance, many of the male members of the staff were a little bit perhaps above the average for entrance to the Civil Service, by reason of the fact that of the male portion of the staff 98 per cent are ex-service men, which is some indication that they would not have come into the service particularly young.

Now, the chief point, of course, in connection with those requests, Mr. Chairman, is that the employees be brought under the Civil Service Act for the purpose of being brought under the Civil Service Superannuation Act. That is really the point at issue. The hesitancy to date in making these employees permanent and bringing them under the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation Act has turned chiefly around that point, that and the possibility of the day coming when the work may be discontinued.

As I hope I may have succeeded in pointing out, there is practically no prospect of that happening before the present members of the staff are in line for retirement through age or before they are removed by other natural causes. Consequently these employees, we submit, should in equity be regarded on the same basis as other civil servants, because after all if many departments are examined, many departments which are regarded to-day as permanent, where the staff is permanent, if they are closely examined on a speculative basis, one might point out reasons why there would be a strong probability that the work would be discontinued in 10, 15, 20 or 25 years. The Interior Department 20 or 25 years ago looked like a good solid organization, yet that did not prove to be the case as far as many of the employees in it were concerned. I just state that to show that it is not always possible to predict as to the permanency of a department. But it certainly does look as though this work carried on by the Soldier Settlement Board would be about as permanent during the next quarter of a century at least as the work of any other department.

There is that other feature, too, concerning settlement other than soldier settlement. If immigration regulations are changed in the years to come to provide for any system of land settlement, the Soldier Settlement Board would naturally provide the staff to look after any such scheme—as it has done already in connection with the 500 family scheme in the case of the province of New Brunswick, for example. This staff would be skilled in the work and would have the organization to carry it out.

I might, for the information of the committee, mention the distribution of the staff.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Phelan, I imagine that is all set out in the annual report, is it not, filed by the Soldier Settlement Board?—A. Well, it would be set out in the annual reports. One might not have it. I do not know whether the staff figures are given in there or not; I do not think they are.

Q. When you speak of distribution you mean as between Ottawa and the outside service?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. And have you got the classification?—A. You mean in salaries?

Q. No, classification of service, that is, inside service, outside service, field service?—A. Yes, I have it that way. It is in the statement headed "Soldier Settlement Staff—particulars as to length of employment".

By the Chairman:

Q. That shows your inside service is 62. What is the total of the outside service?—A. 281 outside.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is outside of Ottawa?—A. Yes, outside of Ottawa.

Q. But none of them are under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act?—A. Oh, none of them at all.

Q. That is what I mean. The outside service is usually called that portion of the service that is not under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act?—A. That is usually the distinction.

Q. Now, these are outside the Act, but there are 281 outside the city of Ottawa?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: So that my terms will not be confusing, I was referring to those working in Ottawa as inside, and all others outside.

By Mr. Bowman:

Q. Have you any classification as to the nature of employment? That is, you have employees in office positions, and then you have field men and so forth; have you any classification of that nature?—A. I have not a classification on that basis, no.

Q. Well, I think that is important for this reason, Mr. Phelan: In 1931 or 1932 the Board advertised a great deal of land for sale, holding public auctions throughout the West, and a great deal of land was sold. Then a lot of land was still left on hand, and in order that the municipalities should not be handicapped because of the fact that the title was vested in the Crown and was not taxable, they decided upon a policy and turned that land over to the municipalities, giving them title to it so that the municipalities, in turn, could endeavour to effect sales and, in that way, bring it back upon the tax roll. If that has taken place, that is, if the Soldier Settlement Board are getting rid of a great deal of this land, then I think it would be of importance to the committee to know how many in your classification are employed in outside service because the work in the field certainly has dropped off very materially from 1931 to the present time, as your figures show.—A. Yes, but you are referring there, Mr. Bowman, to land sold to civilians by the Board?

Q. Yes.—A. That is reverted lands?

Q. Yes.—A. Well, now, the figures which I gave earlier show 5,650 civilian settlers, that is, purchasers of reverted Soldier Settlement farms whose contracts continue up to 1959. These farms were sold under long term contracts, and while the same form of supervision or service is required as would be for land settlers there are the financial arrangements to look after for that term of

years, handling of mortgages, and possibly some of those may revert in the 25 years. Now, there are also 3,058 farms on hand for resettlement or resale, so that that is an integral part of the Board's work and may be expected to continue to a certain extent.

Q. A lot of the land that you have just referred to is very poor quality land, but that land has been turned over to municipalities, giving them title to it, so that they, in turn, could effect sales, resell the land, and in that way bring it back upon the tax rolls?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Civil Service Commission has filed with the committee a very complete statement of employees at present in the service, whose permanency was not affected under the blanketing regulations. In the first schedule, there is a complete list of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, showing the names of all the employees, the positions they hold, where they are located, the date of their appointment and the salaries they receive. I think it contains pretty complete information.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is what I want.

(Mr. Bowman takes chair as Acting Chairman, due to Mr. Lawson being called from room.)

WITNESS: That point, Mr. Chairman, is, of course, an important one, but our submission is that the work may be expected to continue for a period of 25 years; and while the work may fluctuate, it may diminish, in fact, but as many of them have been in the service for 15 years, it may be expected that natural causes will remove many of the staff during that 25-year period. So that even if the work has petered out at the end of the 25-year period, natural causes would practically reduce the staff to a very few people, to one or two people by the time the 25 years are up.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I think in 1932 you gave us figures showing that approximately 10 per cent, taking them over the whole service, dropped out through natural causes, retirements, resignations, deaths, and so forth.

WITNESS: Each year?

Q. Yes.—A. I think 10 per cent is a little high. Right now it would be high, but it would go as high as 5 to 10 per cent; and then, of course, if you selected any one staff, such as the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and if no new appointments were made over a period of years, once the average age had increased to a certain point, natural causes would remove people more rapidly, because with advancing age, naturally, they would not live so long. I have a table here showing the ages of the staff of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and in 1930 there were 71 between 30 and 40, 160 in their forties, 61 in their fifties, and 19 in their sixties. So that they are not a young staff at all; they are getting along in years.

Q. You mentioned the fact that superannuation was one of the vital points in considering these applications?—A. Yes.

Q. For my own information, presume a man started to pay into the superannuation fund at an age, say around 55, what is his retirement allowance based on?—A. Well—

Q. Suppose he retires at the age of 65 and he has paid in for 10 years, what is his retirement allowance based on?—A. If he entered the service at age 55, and suppose he had no prior service whatever, his retiring allowance at 65 would be 20 per cent of what his salary had averaged during his 10 years of employment. Suppose his salary has averaged \$2,000 from age 55 to age 66, and that was all the time he had spent in the service, his retirement allowance would be an annuity of \$400 per annum.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. He would have had to pay a contribution?—A. He would have contributed 5 per cent of his salary each year.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is the superannuation fund, taken as a whole, self-supporting from the contribution of civil service employees?—A. Yes, it has been more than self-supporting to date. That is, the income of the fund has considerably exceeded the expenditure to date.

Q. The point we want to find out is, has the government contributed to the fund?—A. Yes, they contribute against the current payroll.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Are not they supposed to contribute dollar for dollar; was not that the original arrangement?—A. That was the understanding, yes, and they did contribute dollar for dollar, and so far as what are termed current contributions, that is to say, against salary in force at the present time, the government pays in dollar for dollar; but the government has not, however, duplicated contributions made by civil servants in respect to services had prior to the coming into force of the act. The civil servants turned over a matter of several million dollars, I think about 13 million, from the old retirement fund, that was not duplicated, and the civil servants paid in several million dollars in respect to services which had not been paid for currently. That was not duplicated.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The fund, at that time, stood at something like 13 or 14 million dollars, the old retirement fund, to which the government did not contribute anything?—A. Exactly.

Q. Since then they have been on equal basis of 5 per cent?—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Has there been a consolidation of the Soldiers' Settlement Board under the Immigration and Colonization department recently?—A. Well, the Soldiers' Settlement Board is under the department of Immigration, and at the present time I believe an arrangement is effected which makes the deputy minister of Immigration and Colonization likewise a director of the Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Q. Would that have any effect on the relationship of the two departments?—A. In what sense?

Q. In regard to transferring of employees.—A. Well, it would not have yet. It may have, of course, if this staff were made permanent; but assuming that permanent vacancies occur in the staff of the Immigration department, it would not be open at the present time to the transfer of these employees from the Soldiers' Settlement Board to the staff, because they are not under the Civil Service Act. There would be a certain difficulty in the way which would make it impossible; but on the other hand, if these employees were made permanent, then they would really be part and parcel of the Immigration staff, and may be transferred; if the work of the Soldiers' Settlement Board were to diminish further the employees may be transferred into the vacancies, as vacancies occur, on the regular Immigration department staff.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That is really the object behind the application to get them into the position so that they may be transferred from one department service to the other?—A. Partly that, yes; that would be the incidental effect.

Q. Coming back to the case I was talking about, the superannuation; what is that 20 per cent based on?—A. Well, the act allows 2 per cent for each year of service on what is termed "average salary." Now, there are differences as between different categories of people. In very few cases, average salary is rated on the earnings of the last three years. In the case of those who were in the service before the act became effective, it is rated on the last five years; but those who came in after the act was passed, it is rated on the last ten years.

Q. Suppose that man of 55 had been in the service ten years previously, had seen service with the government ten years previously, but had not come under the act until he was 55, what position would he be in?—A. He would have, at the time he was made permanent, the option of electing to pay his 5 per cent abatements respecting salary drawn through his earlier service.

Q. For that first ten years?—A. Yes, plus 4 per cent interest.

Q. And then he comes in and gets 40 per cent?—A. He would get 40 per cent, because he would have 20 years standing, when he reached 65 years. Another option, however, in respect of the non-contributory service is that he might elect to take credit for half of it only, and pay nothing. In other words, without paying up his arrears, he could be given credit for 15 years' service when he reached 65.

Q. Then, the man I am talking about would have the option of getting an extra five years?—A. Yes.

Q. Getting that gratis?—A. Yes, he would get 5 years gratis. If he wanted 10, he would have to pay for the 10.

Q. If, for instance, those people to whom you are now referring had 10 to 15 years' service, and if they were brought in and made permanent and put under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Act they would have a chance of getting the paid up superannuation for half of the period that they had served?—A. If they elected to take it that way, yes, or they may go back and pay up for the years of service that they had, plus 4 per cent interest, and receive credit for the full 15 years.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Would not they elect to take 15 rather than 10?—A. Well, our experience is about 9 out of 10 do. My figure may be a little high, but 8 out of 10 pay for that service. They do pay in 5 per cent abatements, plus 4 per cent interest. Relatively few ever take the half gratis.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. The point I am getting at is this: take a man of 55 years of age who has put in 15 years in the service. By act of parliament he becomes drafted into the service and gets the benefit of the act. Immediately he will have the right to retire and get, say, $7\frac{1}{2}$ years superannuation gratis?—A. You mean if he was at age 65 at the time the change was made?

Q. Yes.—A. If he were at age 65, yes, that would be the effect of it.

Q. If he were anything under that?—A. No, he would have to wait.

Q. He would have to serve that number of years, 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, as the case may be?—A. To bring him up to 65.

Q. Have you figured out in this particular group, to which you are referring, the Soldiers' Settlement staff, what it would mean to those who would be benefited in the matter of superannuation, what benefit would accrue to them at once under this provision of the superannuation act?—A. Well, no, we have not attempted to arrive at any general estimate. It would depend, of course, in each individual case, upon the length of service and the salary the person had been receiving during the last several years and so on.

Q. You have not made any effort in the case of the various members of the group for which you are making representations to estimate what effect it would have in connection with the superannuation fund?—A. No, we have not made any estimate on that.

Q. Would you go so far as to state this: that if these groups were brought in, it would not materially affect the superannuation fund?—A. Oh yes, I would state that with some assurance, for the reason that this group consists of some 300 odd employees. There are about 25,000 under the superannuation act, and in practically every case these 25,000 people had some service at the beginning of their service that had to be fixed up just in the manner we have been discussing, some service that they had not paid for at the time it was had. Now, while the average of the non-contributory service in the case of those people may be a little larger than in the average case of the 25,000, it would not be so much larger at that; and consequently the offsetting effect of putting these 300 odd people in would not be particularly serious.

Q. Just one more question, to get one or two points clear in my own mind. Nobody is entitled to come under the provisions of the superannuation act unless he is a civil servant?—A. Well, you mean by civil servant, unless under the civil service act?

Q. Yes.—A. No; there are some people who are not under the superannuation act, but who are under the civil service act.

Q. Can you describe that group?—A. Yes, the reason for that is, there have been rulings of the Justice department which fixes permanency as something which does not necessarily require appointment under the Civil Service Act. Now, to make myself clear, there are, for example, deputy ministers who are not under the Civil Service Act, but they are permanent. They are allowed to come under the superannuation act. The staff of the Income Tax division of the National Revenue, if they were appointed by order-in-council, were construed as being permanent, and they are allowed to come under the superannuation act. There are some others too, who are in the same category, who were appointed legally, and appointed by order-in-council, and who consequently were allowed to come under the superannuation act. Really, appointments by order-in-council, if not under the Civil Service Act, are taken as permanent appointments.

Q. For instance, how is the staff of the Soldiers' Settlement Board appointed?—A. They were appointed by the department or by the Minister or by the old Soldiers' Settlement Board.

Q. Not by order-in-council.—A. Not by order-in-council.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. They were local selections?—A. Yes, they were.

Q. There were recommendations in those days, and it probably began in that way?—A. Well, the board was established around 1919, and I suppose it was a case of people getting in as best they could.

Q. It was a local selection, and a member of parliament and everybody else made recommendations?—A. I presume so.

Q. That was before the amendment to the Civil Service Act, which stated everything had to be done by competitive examination?—A. Exactly. The appointments were perfectly legal. Orders-in-council were not necessary. They were just taken up as the work required.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. There must be something more than the recommendation of a member of parliament to make a definite appointment.—A. No, because orders in council had exempted the staff from the operations of the Civil Service Act, and invested in the minister the right of appointment.

Mr. ERNST: And the person that the minister wanted to have appointed was appointed?

The WITNESS: Yes. And of course, it is not so long ago that that was done generally.

Mr. ERNST: It is still done in some instances.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. I think you will have to go back a little on that. After the setting up of the board, the engaging of the necessary staff would be done through the board?
—A. Well, of course, the board was in charge.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What I am trying to get at is the difference between the Income Tax department and another department. You say the Income Tax department make their appointments by order in council?—A. Yes; but you see the Income Tax staff was never under the Civil Service Act. The Income Tax staff was exempt from the Civil Service Act by the law governing income tax, and then when the appointments were made in pursuance of that act, made by order in council, it was ruled by the Department of Justice that these were appointments. In other words, that it was competent to make permanent appointments under the Income Tax Act, the War Tax Act, just as competent to do that under that act, as it was to do it under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. EARL LAWSON resumes the Chair.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The appointments to the Soldiers' Settlement Board were ministerial appointments?—A. I think some were made by the commission originally, because the board was under the commission, a good many of them originally.

Q. Under the Income Tax Act the appointments are ministerial appointments, and do not belong to the Civil Service Act?—A. Yes.

Q. But in the case where a ministerial appointment is made and confirmed by order in council, that appointee becomes a permanent one for the purposes of the Civil Service Act?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore, he can get the benefit of superannuation?—A. Exactly.

Q. As I understand it, there are two elements to superannuation; one, that it must be permanent, and the other is the salary must be determined and fixed?—A. Yes, by year.

Q. The difficulty is these people have been employed for some 15 years, but have not been given the chance to acquire permanency, unfortunately, because there was no order in council passed when they were appointed. That is, they are not within the term of permanency, as I understand it, for the purposes of superannuation.

Mr. BOWMAN: I think there must be a distinction somewhere?

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

Mr. BOWMAN: It must be in the discretion of somebody.

The WITNESS: Except if it is under the Income Tax Act, and it is perfectly proper and legal to make appointments by order in council, and that carries permanency with it. It would not, however, in this case, be competent for the Governor in Council to appoint a person by order in council, and then say he is permanent.

Mr. ERNST: Because of the over-riding statute?

The WITNESS: Yes, there is a difference between the two.

Mr. ERNST: An order in council determines permanency in the one case, but it would not necessarily be so in this case.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is the point. You could not make a man permanent just to bring him under the Superannuation Act?

The WITNESS: No, that could not be done.

Mr. ERNST: The point is, you cannot pass an order in council unless you have an authorizing statute.

The WITNESS: Yes. There has to be legislation to base it on, and the Civil Service Act would not provide that. Your point is, Mr. Bowman, you cannot just bring a person under the Civil Service Act and appoint him arbitrarily by order in council. No, that would be illegal. It has got to be a legal appointment.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In one place where it could be done is in the Income Tax Department? —A. It can be done there, because legislation lends itself to that,—it has been interpreted, I should say, in that way; but it would be a different thing altogether with anybody coming under the Civil Service Act, or being in a position exempt by order in council from the Civil Service Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there anything anybody else wishes to ask the witness in regard to the Soldiers' Settlement Board staff? If there are no other questions, Brig. General Ross, president of the Canadian Legion, is here, and I understand he wishes to speak to the committee with reference to one subject matter only. I wonder if the committee would be satisfied to hear him now.

BRIGADIER GENERAL ALEX. ROSS, called.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand you wanted to address the committee with reference to this Soldiers' Settlement Board?

WITNESS: And two other minor matters. May I explain that I am not competent to discuss the details. I am discussing the principle and I am here on behalf of the British Empire Service League, Canadian Legion section, to discuss with you the matter of the permanency of the Soldier Settlement staff. I am submitting to the committee a short memorandum, prepared by myself, which expresses our view. I may summarize it by saying this has been a subject that has faced us for a number of years. I believe in 1930 I made a presentation to parliament at that time in which I dealt with the major problem of Soldier Settlement.

In my memorandum I point out that the Soldier Settlement scheme is a re-establishment measure, and naturally it was expected it would pass away. As things have developed, there is no reasonable opportunity for the scheme being wound up within the time, and these men will probably remain in the service in order to check existing contracts and dispose of virgin lands, and generally realize on the government's investment. We believe that this staff will be required in its entirety during the period which they have to remain in the service. Furthermore, they have other different duties to do. They are doing a great deal of work and also they are a valuable adjunct to the Immigration Department, in the event of immigration opening again or a land settlement scheme being developed, through their experience gained during their long period of service.

Now, view it as a re-establishment measure. This staff was almost entirely as far as the male members were concerned, I think 90 per cent ex-service men, who came immediately from overseas and entered the service. A large percentage of them have had probably fourteen years in the government service, and from three to five years war service. Therefore, they have given a very

considerable portion of their life to public service. Yet, to-day, after all these years, they still find themselves in the position of temporary employees. They have no superannuation; they have no security, and besides that, they have no chance of promotion.

They are very very highly regarded throughout the country. They have a very difficult task to perform in handling those government contracts; because you know it is always more difficult to collect government money than it is any other kind of money. They have to perform that task with reasonable efficiency and also with the necessary degree of tact. I have made personal contact with them travelling, as I do, throughout the country, and I find that they are men of very very high type—I am talking of the field staff, particularly. As far as I know, at the head office they are equally efficient.

Mr. BOWMAN: Quite so.

WITNESS: Our submission is we have to-day a large body of returned soldiers, probably 300, who have given the best years of their lives to the country's service, who have no real claim to be now recognized and given all the advantages that should come to civil servants in the employ of the government. We think that is wrong. The present Prime Minister, in 1928, made a very strong declaration in favour of permanency. The matter has been reported in Hansard, and we will file the reference. Other ministers have expressed opinions in favour of it. However, we never seem to get to the point where the appointments have come. We think this should be seriously considered, and that these men should be given their proper status, because they are doing a valuable service now and they are capable of giving even more valuable service because of the training they have received, if the opportunity is afforded them.

Mr. BOWMAN: The figures which have been given prior to the time you speak of, by Mr. Phelan, are illuminating, I think. The maximum appointments were 700 some years back. In 1931 the total was 501. There has been a reduction since then of about 30 per cent—158. Now, there are 342. That is, from 700 we have a reduction of 343. The point which presents itself to me now is, do we think that that has become the minimum, allowing for those who dropped out of the service from time to time?

WITNESS: I would say absolutely, sir. You have to-day 11,000 odd farms on which there have been temporary settlers, and these farms have to be looked after, disposed of, kept rented and supervised, and rents collected. In addition to that, they, the staff, have now practically become part of the Department of Immigration, and are available for any immigration scheme which develops. In addition to that, there is no chance of reduction just now, I think you might take it that they have been reduced to a minimum. That would be my inference, knowing as I do the work they are doing. I would say they have been reduced to an irreducible minimum.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. In other words, in so far as the purely soldier settlement part of the scheme is concerned, or the work is concerned, there may be, or there will be a reduction as time goes on, but the other phase of it is likely to increase and offset it?—A. It is likely to increase and offset it, with the normal reduction of staff in the course of time. Then, in 1930 all these soldier settlement contracts were extended, and they will have a number of years to run; and by reason of the depressed condition which has existed during the last few years, there are very few soldier settlers who have been able to make their payments, and consequently, debts accumulated, and therefore the contracts will run far beyond the reasonable limit, before they can make any payments. You have a new settlement scheme

coming, and land going to be sold; also they have the duties they are performing for the Department of National Health in war veterans' allowances. The Government requires this staff to do work for that department.

Q. What do they do in connection with war veterans' allowances?—A. They make all investigations in regard to allowing cases for the Department of National Health, some investigations for the Board of Pensions; in fact, every odd job where they can use them, they are being used. They find them to be an ideal staff for any type of work.

Q. Do you think war veterans' allowances are likely to increase?—A. According to our figures, they are bound to increase. The peak will not be reached until 1955. So I suggest to you, while there may be some force in the argument the government used that this was not a permanent staff, it has now reached the point where it can be said to have a very, very great degree of permanency. I suggest to you, these gentlemen are very worthy gentlemen. They have done a great deal of service, and they should be given at least some security, as they are reaching mature years. I do not know what the average age is, but I know the average age of the soldier is 40 years. I imagine that applies to the members of this staff. It is a matter in which our organization is particularly interested, because we appreciate the work these men have done. We do feel they have not been adequately recognized; that they should get that recognition as soon as possible. I am simply here to say I have no desire to condemn, but to ask the government to do that which we feel should be done, and give these gentlemen that which we think they are entitled to, and have a right to. Have I covered that?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you.

WITNESS: There are two other points to which I want to refer, and to draw to your attention, which I think is only a matter of correcting what may be called an oversight. I refer to section 6 of subsection 2 of the Superannuation Act, where an anomaly exists. That section of the act provides that any man who enlisted from the government service either with or without leave and on re-entering government service was entitled to count the war service as superannuation.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 2 of section 6 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act?

WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: I think your memorandum makes your point clear.

WITNESS: It is an oversight. They gave express permission that a man who got leave would count his service, and the man who put on his hat and walked out without leave, could count his service, but the fellow who could not be spared for some apparent reason, but who, in order to serve his country, resigned, could not get it. In many cases it does seem an extraordinary hardship that a man who did the decent thing, resigned and went immediately into His Majesty's service, should not be treated in the same way.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The most unfair discrimination.

The WITNESS: It has been there a long time; and I really think it is time that that anomaly was corrected, because the cases are not numerous, except insofar as temporaries are concerned. I have prepared a graph in regard to temporary employees, who have become permanent. (Witness files graph). You will notice these men at the top are all soldiers. You notice this space down the middle here. These men went to the war, their superannuation service counts from there to the right. Their pre-war service is from there to the left. Here are men who did not go overseas. Their service continues, and that shows you the men who went overseas have been unfairly dealt with, I think, I endeavoured to get some measure of justice there, and I think I have succeeded.

Mr. BOWMAN: Have you extra copies of that graph for the members?

The WITNESS: No, I just got that last night.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you leave that copy with the Clerk of the committee?

The WITNESS: Yes. The other point I wish to bring to your attention is one which I do not think involves any expenditure of money. I think it is only fair that the man who has entered the government service after the war should be allowed to count his war service as superannuation on whatever basis you gentlemen might decide. I am not asking anything out of the way, because that principle is already generally recognized in the militia pensions and in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and under both superannuation schemes, a man in either one of those bodies, who was taken into the force after the war, is allowed to add his war service. Actually, in the case of officers under the Militia Pensions Act, not only are they allowed to count their war service, but they are allowed to count their militia service. Therefore, parliament has already recognized the principle. And when a man who was perhaps too young to enter the government service, volunteered and went overseas and served overseas and returned and found a place in the civil service, I suggest to you he was serving the Crown quite worthily, and he should certainly have as much right to have the principle of pre-war service taken into account as the R.C.M.P. to have all their service added to their superannuation. As the law stands now, the soldier who went overseas and came back and finds himself re-established in the civil service is not going to be able to accumulate a sufficient superannuation to enable him to live decently in comfort when he is retired; whereas, if he had war services in all probability, when he is about to retire, in some cases, he would as a result of the war service, be able to retire on a decent superannuation.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. As I understand it, you mean those returned men who entered the service subsequent to the war?—A. Yes.

Q. Their war service should count in the superannuation?—A. His service does count, if he went from the service, but the man who entered since and who has put in war service overseas, should be allowed to count that for superannuation purposes. Just on what method of contribution you gentlemen can decide that. It does not cost the country anything.

Q. Is not that a great deal to expect. After all, we give a preference in law to the returned men.—A. As I understand it, the superannuation scheme, at present, is self-supporting, and these gentlemen would contribute to the scheme on the same basis as is done now. If these men impose no further liability on the country, I cannot see how it is going to upset the scheme.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not think it is a question of cost at all.

The WITNESS: If it was a matter of financial expenditure, I would not mention it. It is not anything hard at present; it is not unreasonable.

Mr. BOWMAN: I think the point raised by Mr. Ernst is a good one. Preference does exist at the present time and in many cases that preference has been responsible for the appointment of the man?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. ERNST: Some one else would have got the position.

Mr. BOWMAN: Then you realize it is a question of time. How are you going to apply it, if a man got a position one year, three years, five years, or ten years after the war?

The WITNESS: We would accept whatever you gentlemen think was fair. Suppose a man entered the service shortly after the war. He might reasonably

and probably would have entered the service before, had he stayed at home. I say "probably". That was presented to me first in Saskatchewan where I live, and when the legion put it up to me, I said, "You are crazy," but they went to the government and the government said, "There is something in it—" That was the Saskatchewan government. That was up to 1925—

Mr. ERNST: I think we almost have to concede that quite a number of returned men got into the service over the heads of men who could pass a much better competitive examination but who were not returned men; they got in because of that preference clause. I have in mind, for instance, competitive examinations where what you might call the civilian was probably a good deal better qualified for the post than the returned man, and the returned man has got that position because of the preference. I think he should. I quite agree.

Mr. BOWMAN: So do I.

Mr. ERNST: But it is clear that there are many younger men who have graduated from universities and never had a chance of going to war.

The WITNESS: On the contributory basis I do not see that anyone is hurt. At the same time you are giving the soldier an opportunity to retire at the proper age on a retiring allowance.

The CHAIRMAN: No. I think you are proceeding on the assumption that the contribution or the deduction made from the civil servant's pay maintains the superannuation fund. It does not, as I understand it. The superannuation fund, as I understand it, has been set up on an actuarial basis, the basis of the actuary being that if the employer contributes an amount—I am not sure whether it is an amount equivalent to that paid by the civil servant or not—then it is on the basis of actuarial sums. So, if we were to recommend now what you submit to us we would be imposing upon the people of the country as a whole, or upon the fund, a burden equivalent to the amount which the civil servant is paying even though the man is required to pay for all that number of years as a condition precedent to getting in the fund.

The WITNESS: It is the same principle in the permanent force. The Militia Pension Act does the same thing.

The CHAIRMAN: No. With regard to the Militia Pension Act it is rather on a different basis. If a man is in the permanent Militia Service of the country I do not think his superannuation fund is endeavoured to be set up on an actuarial basis at all.

The WITNESS: The officers' fund is on a contributory basis.

Mr. ERNST: Is it purely contributory?

The WITNESS: It is contributory; 5 per cent.

Mr. ERNST: There is a government contribution too, is there not?

The WITNESS: I presume so.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it equal to the amount contributed by the civil servant?

The WITNESS: In any event, you will find that in subsection 12 of section 4 provision is made. The principle there is that any officer in the permanent force since the war, who has served in the great war, is entitled to one-half his militia service and double his war service as superannuation. I was in the permanent force myself for one year. At that time I think I went in with an accumulated service of fifteen years before I started.

Mr. MACINNIS: That regulation covers officers only, does it?

The WITNESS: And the men too. The men are non-contributory.

By the Chairman:

Q. They do not come under the ordinary Superannuation Act?—A. No, with regard to the men it is a pure contribution from the government.

Q. The whole scheme does not come under the general Superannuation Act?—A. No.

Q. Now, when you come to consider the general Superannuation Act relating to all civil servants with a view to having that on an actuarial basis there is an advisory board or committee set up which is representative of the various civil servant organizations. We have already referred to that Board and asked for the benefit of their views with respect to several matters, one of which is that veterans in temporary positions at the time of enlistment should have their overseas service time counted for the purpose of their superannuation. We will, no doubt, also ask them for their views on the problem you are now submitting; but I am anxious that you should realize that it is not an easy question to dispose of for the one reason I have pointed out and for another reason that was pointed out by other members of the committee. We must keep that fund on a basis that is actuarially sound?—A. Absolutely.

Q. And, therefore, the problem in its final analysis seems to be: are we justified in adding to the preferences now given to returned men a burden which we ask the government to assume in order to keep actuarially sound the superannuation fund?—A. I must admit I was proceeding on the basis that the fund was actuarially sound at the present without government contribution.

Q. Without government contribution?—A. I suggest the case of a man entering the service a short time after he came home. It might be extended—not unlimited—a reasonable time for the purpose of insuring an adequate retiring allowance; otherwise, he would have to find some other way when he is old. If not, the other alternative is that a provision should be made for his continuation in the service until such time as he has accumulated a reasonable amount, provided he is physically fit. Nobody insists that these men should be kept on if they cannot do the job. The point is that the returned soldier should be—a definition of his war service should be a reasonable retiring allowance before he is compulsorily retired. I suggest what I think will meet the case: I think he should not be compulsorily retired, providing he is physically fit, until he has twenty years' service.

Mr. BOWMAN: Applications for extension of service have been pretty leniently dealt with.

WITNESS: Sometimes they did not all go through. These are the points which the Legion submits. I understand that submissions will be made to you in respect of temporary employees and prevailing rates employees. I was going to bring that matter forward but we suggested it was a matter for the civil service employees themselves, except that there are a great many of these men who are returned soldiers, and the Legion is naturally, I think, anxious that you should give sympathetic consideration to the submissions made on behalf of the Civil Service Association. I know you will. I endorse the application to that extent; I am not initiating it. The Legion tries to proceed on the basis that we limit our activities to the matters concerning ourselves, but a large number of our men are interested in these two categories, and we will appreciate very much if you can give them some assistance.

Mr. BOWMAN: Your representations have been very fair.

By the Chairman:

Q. General Ross, I would like to ask for your views on a problem that gave this committee a good deal of concern when it sat two years ago and which will give it a good deal of concern now, and I want you to realize that if you do not care to express an opinion you are perfectly at liberty to say so. Here is our problem: under the Civil Service Act a general preference for appointment is given to returned soldiers; then we have what is known as a special disability preference, and under that disability preference, with which

you are probably very familiar, the man who is in receipt of a substantial pension gets a preference over his fellow veteran who is not in receipt of a pension for Civil Service appointment; and therefore he is assured of a double income from the government. Many instances have come to our attention where as a result of that a man who is a disability pensioner and who may have no dependents, or only one dependent, arbitrarily gets a preference over the chap who maybe has five, six, seven or eight dependents. And I must say, and I have been hesitating in expressing it, that my observation has been that it does work a hardship. We are terribly concerned with the problem. Would you care to express any views in connection with it?—A. I just want to say that I am not going to commit myself now, although I am perfectly aware of the problem.

Q. General Ross, I might say for your information that Mr. Herwig, who was before this committee two years ago, when confronted with the same problem was bound to take the position—I think quite properly—that so far as he was concerned the Legion had passed a general resolution that it should be maintained. Now, I happen to be a member of the Legion, and I know that that is not the view of the branch of which I am a member; or of many of the branches in my district?—A. I am perfectly familiar with the problem. I may say that I had some rather heated discussions on the subject, and there is a very marked division of opinion about it.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. It has been that way since the Committee of 1923. We had the same difficulty there?—A. I imagine the preponderance of opinion to-day is in favour of modifying that provision.

By Mr. Ernst:

Q. It would seem to make a big difference whether a man has a job, or any expectation of one?—A. Let me outline the situation as I see it, and as I have dealt with it when the question has been put to me. Originally this provision was put into the act as a re-establishment measure, for the purpose of providing sheltered employment for disabled veterans. The government recognized that he was handicapped by war wounds, which are a serious difficulty to any man. The purpose of this re-establishment measure was to give a man preference in employment, providing he could do the job. That was a sound principle, the principle of sheltered employment for disabled men. Everything was all right. I think, until this period of depression came upon us, and then they began to ask the question as to why a man who is getting a special pension should also have a job—that he ought not to have a job if he has a pension. Now, it is a very difficult question to answer, and the reason it is becoming difficult now is largely because there are not enough jobs to go around.

The CHAIRMAN: And it has been aggravated by the present economic conditions. On account of the conditions through which we are passing the question has been put on an entirely different footing.

Mr. ERNST: But if we are to apply it, say with reference to government, it would still leave the same condition existing with reference to private corporations—admitting they do not give a preference. There are men who enjoy substantial pensions; but whether a man has a pension or not, that has nothing to do with anything else. I am one of those who take the view that a man's pension is nobody's business.

The WITNESS: I agree, that is exactly the basis on which I approach this problem. I say you cannot decide it in the light of economic conditions. A man's pension is nobody's business. If any man has a disability and is able to utilize his remaining strength for the purpose of maintaining himself and his

family through other employment, I think he is entitled rather to credit than to criticism. That is my view, and that is the basis on which I have defended the preference as it exists. Every opportunity should be given to a disabled man to utilize his strength and ability to the utmost of his opportunity. There is this other idea, though, that possibly in the time of depression, it might be possible to give a married man—non-pensioner—preference over a single pensioner who has enough to live on. These are hard cases. I call to mind one case where a man with six children was thrown out of a temporary job and a single man put in.

Mr. ERNST: It is a pretty hard thing to get a government to give back anything once it has been taken away. Possibly General Ross would like to give a little time to this, and perhaps submit a memorandum about it later.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a very important matter to us, and I am sure if you would care to submit them the committee would be very glad to have your views.

The WITNESS: My personal view is that a pension is a matter of right and it should not be touched. I believe the legislation is fundamentally sound, but perhaps economic conditions tend to make it appear unsound. I do not like to concede the principle that any government or employer has any right to take into consideration the pension which a man receives. That is his, and it is nobody's business what he does with it; and I do not want to take away that principle by conceding the point that was raised; but I do think that possibly there are some ways by which we can get around it. Once we concede that principle either to the government or to the employers, the pensioner is in a very bad way. I cannot abandon the principle that a pension is not income. A pension is compensation which the government agrees to pay. It is a man's own, and no employer of labour has a right to consider it at all. In other words, his earning ability is reduced to the extent to which he is pensioned; therefore, to that extent he has lost his capacity to earn an income on the basis of labour. It is only intended to make up his earning power to that which he should have had on the basis of manual labour.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact that is the presumption on which the principle of all pensions is based and applied.

The WITNESS: Absolutely, and we do not want to impair that principle, because when we do, we do not know where it will end up. That was our objection to the legislation brought down last year. Employers of labour would undoubtedly exploit it. However, I will give that consideration and see what I can do. I will take it up with Mr. Bowler and see if we can arrive at any formula that will assist you out of your difficulty. At the same time, I am not conceding the principle myself; my opposition probably would, but at present they are not here and I have outlined the policy as I see it.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you, General. I may say that the views that you have expressed to this committee have not lost any of their force by reason of the moderation of your opinions, and the moderation with which you have expressed them.

The WITNESS: That is how I accomplish things, sir. I hope you will not forget my Soldier Settlers.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

The witness was discharged.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE CANADIAN LEGION
OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE IN REFERENCE
TO THE STATUS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE SOLDIER SETTLE-
MENT BOARD

To the Chairman and Members of the
Parliamentary Committee on Civil Service:

GENTLEMEN,—As Dominion President of the Canadian Legion, I am directed by the Organization, which I represent, to request that definite action be now taken with a view to extending permanency of appointment to the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board. For your information, I may say that this action has been approved by successive Dominion Conventions of this organization and was expressly re-affirmed at the last Convention held in Ottawa, March 12th-14th inclusive, 1934, as appears by the attached resolution. In support of this application, I wish to make the following submissions:—

I. Organization

The Soldier Settlement Scheme was devised as a re-establishment measure. As we understand it, the Government of the day was impressed with the necessity of absorbing a considerable proportion of the demobilized army and so relieving the strain which would otherwise be imposed upon the labour market. It was also at that time the commonly accepted belief that there was room for almost indefinite exploitation of the agricultural resources of the country. A land settlement scheme appeared to meet both requirements. It was presumably felt that in the nature of things such a scheme would work itself out in a certain period of time; and hence it could not be regarded as permanent. Unfortunately, this has not proved to be the case. Fundamental weaknesses in the scheme itself, coupled with continued depreciation in the value of farm products, has tended to delay liquidation and there can now be no reasonable hope of early liquidation of the large sums now owing. Outstanding contracts have to be collected, effective supervision maintained, and salvaged lands must be disposed of. If, therefore, the Government is to realize its investment, an efficient staff will have to be maintained for that purpose. It is submitted that no other body is so adequately fitted to discharge this duty as the present staff.

II. Position of the Staff

Being a re-establishment measure, it was quite appropriate that the staff as organized should be recruited largely from ex-service men. In the selection, the Government was singularly fortunate and a headquarters and field staff was built up which for faithful discharge of duty, and general efficiency, could not easily be surpassed. The field force particularly have had a very difficult task. The Soldier Settlers are a very fine body of men and splendid citizens but they have their peculiarities just as has every class and exceptional tact and care is required in dealing with them. That the field force has been so successful in performing their difficult duties speaks well for their personal qualifications.

III. Case for Permanency

The majority of the members of this staff have now given fifteen or sixteen years of service. As pointed out, they have given efficient service. In addition to this, they gave from three to five of the best years of their lives in the Service of their Country in war. It will be found that the majority of them have out-

standing records of Military Service. They are now no longer young. They are approaching the time when it is difficult for a man to re-establish himself in any other class of work. Yet they have no permanency of appointment, they have no provision for old age, save such savings as they may be able to make and they have no hope of advancement in the Government Service. It is submitted that this is not fair to a body of men whose record of service is, as indicated, outstanding.

With the return to normal times, the Government will doubtless be faced with the necessity of embarking on new Colonization schemes. Here we have a body of men trained for years in such work, with a most complete knowledge of land settlement and all its problems, and ready at hand for any such undertaking. In the meantime, they can be and are profitably engaged in preserving the great investment made by the people of this country in this scheme as well as performing other necessary and valuable duties. They are charged with the care of the British Settlers under the British Family Scheme, they conduct enquiries in the remotest areas on behalf of the War Veterans' Allowance Committee and other Government bodies. Generally, they are a versatile and useful body of public servants, who should be given adequate consideration in recognition of duties well and faithfully performed.

For these reasons, we urge most strongly that provision should be made at the earliest possible date to give due recognition to these War Veterans who, having served their Country well in war, have given equally faithful service in times of peace.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) ALEX. ROSS,
*Dominion President,
Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L.*

RESOLUTION *RE* SOLDIER SETTLEMENT STAFF PASSED AT THE
DOMINION CONVENTION OF THE CANADIAN LEGION OF
THE B.E.S.L., OTTAWA, MARCH 12-15, 1934.

That the Dominion Executive Council be, and is hereby instructed, to renew representations to the Government of Canada with a view to securing satisfactory adjustment of the problem of granting permanent status to the ex-service men employed by the Soldier Settlement Board, many of whom have been employees of the Board for a great many years and are deprived of the benefits enjoyed by other civil servants on the permanent staff.

And, further, that similar action be taken in behalf of ex-service men or women who have been employed in any branch of the Civil Service for five years or more.

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE CANADIAN
LEGION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE IN
REFERENCE TO WAR SERVICE AND SUPERANNUATION.

To the Chairman and Members of the Parliamentary
Committee on Civil Service.

There has been complaint for many years in regard to the interpretation placed by the Justice Department on Section 6, subsection (2) of The Superannuation Act which deals with the counting of war service towards Superannuation. These rulings limit the provisions of the Act only to those in the Civil Service who obtained leave of absence to enlist, or who had enlisted without leave but did not resign for that purpose.

In October, 1924, the following specific ruling was given by the Justice Department in regard to those who had resigned:—

Where an employee in the Civil Service resigned in order to enlist his period of absence on Active Service will not count.

This ruling affected both permanent and temporary employees. On May 22, 1930, however, an opinion was expressed by the Deputy Minister of Justice to the effect that the Governor in Council is competent to pass regulations authorizing the counting of war service for purposes of superannuation to those classes, both permanent and temporary who resigned to go overseas. However, as far as we have been able to ascertain no such Order in Council has ever been promulgated.

There has also developed considerable opinion particularly during the past few years supporting a proposal to permit war service to count, even in cases where the ex-service man entered the Civil Service subsequent to discharge from war service. Resolutions have been passed at successive Dominion conventions urging such a provision be included in the Act. The Act, of course, does not take cognizance of war service in such cases. Section 6, subsection (2) of the Superannuation Act reads as follows:—

If the service of the contributor has not been continuous the period or periods during which such service has been discontinued shall not be counted in computing the allowance; provided, however, that absence on active service in the Great War, whether with or without leave of absence, shall not be deemed a discontinuance of service.

Thus, ex-service men who entered the Civil Service subsequent to discharge are clearly outside the scope of the Act. However, the principle of including the war service of those, who did not enlist from the Service, has been recognized in legislation governing other public servants, i.e., the R.C.M.P. Act and the Militia Pension Act. There are further reasons why favourable consideration should be given to this class of Civil Servant:—

- (1) War service deprived him of the opportunity of entering the Civil Service during service overseas and, in many instances, during the period of convalescence or a period for education subsequent to discharge to fit him to return to civilian life;
- (2) Years of war service were wasted years in so far as any preparation for old age is concerned;
- (3) Age limits to ex-service men were waived on entering the service. Thus, many ex-service men approach retiring age with the possibility of securing no adequate maintenance from their superannuation.
- (4) War service was extraordinary service to the country, which might well be given recognition with other types of Government service now accepted under the Superannuation Act.

OTTAWA, May 16, 1934.

Mr. V. C. PHELAN recalled.

By the Chairman:

Q. Now Mr. Phelan, if you will forgive the interruption, I happened to know that General Ross has some other duties and had to get away.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is about all I have to say in connection with the Soldiers Settlement Board. You yourself referred to the fact that the annual report of the Board would rather fully cover the duties which the Board perform. As I mentioned when I began dealing with that subject, I have made an extended memorandum here which I did not bother to read. We have discussed most of it, and I am assuming that in order to get a general idea of the work of the Board of members of the Committee at least will likely be reading the annual report of the Board, which will give them a clearer picture.

The last point in connection with the Soldier Settlement Board which we were discussing involved the question of permanency. I might say that I would like to make it clear that our recommendations in connection with this particular matter is that the employees be brought wholly under the Civil Service Act, and that they be made permanent under the Act.

Mr. ERNST: I think we have got that pretty clearly, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: The reason of course is that there is a little more than superannuation involved; there is the question of transfer to other positions.

Mr. ERNST: And promotions.

The WITNESS: And promotions.

The CHAIRMAN: Annual increases, and so on.

The WITNESS: Yes, exactly; and if they were brought under the Civil Service Act, then there would be no question of doubt about their eligibility for these things which ordinarily are associated with the permanent service. That, I think, is all we have to submit at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN: As this seems to be a convenient stopping point in your presentation, Mr. Phelan, I think it would be as well if we were to adjourn until four o'clock.

The Committee adjourned at 1:05 p.m. to meet again this day at 4 o'clock p.m.

The Committee resumed at 4 p.m.

Mr. MACINNIS: I understand the Chairman is unavoidably absent this afternoon, and I would move that Mr. Bowman take the chair. Carried.

V. C. PHELAN (Examination resumed).

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Phelan, will you proceed with the next point?

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the next point is that of those long term temporaries in various departments many of whom were eligible at one time to be blanketed in as permanent civil servants under the Civil Service Act, but in respect of whom no such action was taken at the time that the blanketing in Orders in Council were in effect.

We secured some figures on this subject, because while we have many members who are affected, our own figures would not be quite complete. There are 316 in all of these people who were eligible to be blanketed in before the blanketing in Orders in Council expired, but who were not blanketed in at that time.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What year would that be?—A. Well, that was prior to 1927. The blanketing in Order in Council was rescinded, May 5th, 1927, although from 1924 on practically none were blanketed in, or at least very very few.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. And none since 1927?—A. None since 1927, practically none of them. There may have been just a very few odd individual cases dealt with for special reason, but there has been no general blanketing in since 1927.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You are now referring to those who were in the service prior to 1927?—A. Well, prior to 1919. They were all in the service at the time the Civil Service Act as it now stands came into force, the date being, as I remember it, the 10th November, 1919.

Q. And it is prior to that?—A. These 316 to whom I refer were all in the service prior to that time; 305 of them are men and 11 are women. Of the men, 52 had overseas service and 253 are, I might say, civilians.

Q. What is that again?—A. Well, the figures are divided as follows:—

Males with overseas active service	52
Females	11
Other males	253

making a total of 316.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is that as it stands now or as it was in 1927?—A. That is as it stands to-day, but of course these people of that class who would have been eligible to have been blanketed in at that time.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I did not get the first words. In what branch are you talking about?—A. Those are divided in various departments—Agriculture, Finance, Marine (Lightkeepers), National Defence, Pensions and National Health, Public Works, Railways and Canals. Those are the departments affected; they are scattered throughout those departments. Public Works, I might say, has 192 out of the 316.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Perhaps in order to have the record complete you had better say in what departments they are.—A. Do you wish me to read it or shall I just give it to the reporter for the record? I will read it if you wish.

Q. It should go into the record.—A. I will read it if you wish.

Q. Yes, I wish you would.

The WITNESS: The statement is as follows:—

STATEMENTS OF EMPLOYEES AT PRESENT IN THE SERVICE WHOSE PERMANENCY
WAS NOT EFFECTED UNDER BLANKETING REGULATIONS OF 1920-27

Department	Male OAS	Female	Other Males
Agriculture.....	0	0	1
Finance.....	1	0	0
Marine.....	1	0	15
Lightkeepers.....	0	0	9
National Defence.....	11	0	16
Pensions and National Health.....	2	11	1
Public Works.....	23	0	169
Railways and Canals.....	14	0	42
Total.....	52	11	253
Soldier Settlement Board.....	101	15	0
Historical Section (Nat. Def.).....	3	2	0
Total.....	104	17	10

I suppose it is not necessary to mention that these, of course, are additional to the Soldier Settlement Board that was being discussed this morning.

We would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the committee give consideration to this matter, with a view to seeing if it cannot be recommended that these people be brought within the scope of the Civil Service Act; in other words, that they be made permanent.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What is the nature of the employment of most of them, and the permanency of it, part time and so forth?—A. Those are all full-time employees.

Q. All full time?—A. All full-time employees, yes, and as to the nature of the permanency of the position that would vary with the department; but that can be rather assumed from the fact that they have been in at least fifteen years.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But, Mr. Phelan, those are the ones who would qualify for Civil Service positions? You are not including in that, for instance, the Public Works employees whose memorandum you are submitting later, I understand.—A. No, these others come in that class commonly known as prevailing rate employees. These persons are all in positions which would be normally classified positions, positions which would be normally paid at a stated annual salary and, of course, quite apart from the prevailing rate employees.

It is difficult now to determine just why those people were not blanketed in at the time the blanketing-in Order in Council was in effect. In some cases, perhaps, it was through inaction on the part of the department. The employees at the time may not have realized the effect of it and did not ask for it and possibly did not get it for that reason; there may have been some other reasons, but the fact is that these people are now in the service at least fifteen years, which would indicate the permanence of their employment, and they are not given the privileges that are usually associated with permanency, except that many of them—most in fact—were permitted to come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act; their permanency was recognized to that extent when the Civil Service Superannuation Act was passed; but otherwise they are not eligible for promotion. And while it is not a matter that is of immediate concern at such times as annual increases or statutory increases are being given, those people are not in line for any statutory increases. That is somewhat anomalous, when you remember that thousands of other people in the service but junior to them are entitled to statutory increases.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. And their service no different?—A. Generally speaking, no different.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That number is 316?—A. 316.

Q. Does that represent those who have been up to 15 years in the service?—A. Yes.

Q. You draw the line at 15 years?—A. Yes, and the reason for that is this, that the blanketing in Order in Council which was rescinded in 1927 drew that dead line. That is why I referred to that date November 10, 1919. There are some long term temporaries who have been in service several years though who have entered the service since November, 1919. Those who were appointed between 1919 and the 31st December, 1924, are confined to the Department of National Defence, and they have 29 of them. I have not any figures on those who were appointed since 1924, from 1924 to 1934, though we are told that there are some who have been in 7, 8 or 9 years who are still temporary.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Do you make any application on behalf of the 29 to which you have referred?—A. We would like to see the action taken to be rather comprehensive, if possible at all.

Q. Give me the details of that group again.—A. Well, those appointed later than the 10th November, 1919, but before December 31, 1934, National Defence, 26 male employees having overseas active service, and 3 other male employees, no females, a total of 29.

Q. What is the reason that they do not come under the Act?—A. I do not know. It is pretty difficult to discover the reasons; sometimes it is just that the department has had a certain method of dealing with employees of a particular class, and they have not been accustomed to bother to get them made permanent and they just let matters drift along.

Q. Are they all in favour of coming under the Act?—A. As far as we know they are, and as far as that other class is concerned we have had numerous petitions from those in Public Works, and in Marine, and in Railways and Canals, and in National Defence.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Before you leave the former class, those people are holding positions which, in the ordinary course of events, would be called permanent positions?—A. Yes. That is, the work is of a permanent character as far as can be determined. That, of course, refers to both classes.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Referring to the first 316, do you know of any reason, or is there any legitimate reason why they should not be made permanent?—A. I know of no reason. It is difficult, impossible in fact, to find out why they were not blanketed in at the time. Perhaps it was through carelessness on the part of someone, but it is quite a while ago now and it is hard to find that out. There is never any reason put up by the department as to why such action should not be taken. We have never had one stated to us.

MR. CHEVRIER: I suppose it is one of those anomalies that grows up in the service, but that is the reason we are here, to see if we can cure the anomalies.

THE WITNESS: That is about what it amounts to because there were a great many others blanketed in at that time who were in positions quite similar in all respects to those people who were left out, which would indicate, of course, that these people might just as well have been included at that time.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Was it not because of the failure to recommend on behalf of the department by the deputy at the time?—A. That is true, but why the deputies failed to recommend it is impossible to determine when the question has been discussed with the department or with the deputy; there has never been any reason assigned.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But apparently it was not because of any deficiency in their work, because they have been holding the positions all these years?—A. Well no, and those people are not individuals scattered here and there who were not blanketed in; they constitute groups; there are certain classes. For instance, the Marine Department has a staff down in Prescott, Ontario. I think one of the members, —Mr. Casselman—who gave evidence the other day before the committee referred to them. Those people have come to us several times about this matter and the whole group was left out.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. And there are some at Sorel too?—A. Yes, there are some at Sorel too. That is Public Works Department, is it not?

Mr. LAURIN: Marine.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And there are many in Ottawa?—A. Yes, some of those elevator operators who have been in for 15 years are still temporary; they were allowed to come under the superannuation Act, but they are still in a temporary capacity.

That, Mr. Chairman, is our suggestion with regard to that matter. It is one of long standing, and it is one that ought to be cleared up.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether we would be heard on the subject of promotions in the Civil Service at the present time. A considerable number of vacancies which occur are abolished almost automatically, and we have some observations that we would like to submit on that subject if the committee is prepared to hear them.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think that is quite pertinent, because I think there is something in the report of the Civil Service Commission to the effect that lack of promotion is not conducive to the betterment of the service, but that on the other hand it constitutes an impediment in some ways. I think the subject is quite pertinent.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well personally, I do not know just how far this committee can go. It is a matter of governmental policy to a certain extent, but I do not see any reason why we should not hear your representations.

The WITNESS: Well, Mr. Chairman, our representations are very much in line with the section of the Civil Service Commission report to which Mr. Chevrier has referred.

As you understand, at the present time under Order in Council where vacancies occur they are very carefully scrutinized and, in most cases, the vacancies are abolished, promotions are not made. Because a man may happen to leave the service for any cause whatever does not, of course, mean that his work ceases to exist, and the work has to be given to somebody else. At a time of such financial stringency as the present, one would expect that vacancies would be most carefully scrutinized, with a view to seeing whether it was necessary to carry them along or whether they could be abolished; but the existing regulations really go beyond that, and really go beyond the point which, we think, and submit, was not in contemplation at the

time that that Order in Council was originally put through. That is to say, the first Order in Council respecting promotions was passed nearly two years ago, and since that time the number of actual promotions which have been made has been so very small, that with the holding up of promotions and the stopping of annual increases, conditions throughout the civil service have become partially, I might say, stagnant.

Now, it might be said that with money as scarce as it is, that that is an inevitable situation; but the fact is, that when the annual increases are not being granted the making of promotions does not involve a very considerable sum of money. It is impossible to generalize and state an average sum which promotions may cost, but anyone looking at the Civil Service Commission's classification will observe that the spread between classes in the Civil Service—the spread in dollars and cents—is relatively small, and as in most cases people to be promoted are those who are at the maximum of a lower class and as they would only step up to the minimum of the new grade and remain there, the sum to be spent would not be very much. We have tried to secure some estimate as to what all promotions would cost if they were proceeded with, but we have failed to do so. We have had a figure quoted to us.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Have you any approximate idea?—A. We have had a figure quoted to us, a figure of something like \$480,000 per annum.

Q. Do you remember seeing a statement that was sent out by some gentleman from Vancouver? I do not know whether all the members were circularized, but I received a statement in which it was claimed that the cutting out of promotions and the yearly increases, and the reducing of the number of employees in the service, had resulted in a saving of \$18,000,000 to the government?—A. That \$18,000,000, Mr. Chairman, was arrived at this way: First of all—

Q. Of course, I am bearing in mind the 10 per cent cut?—A. Well, first of all there is about \$8,000,000 out for the 10 per cent cut, I think \$7,800,000. In the second place, it also includes the saving which has resulted from staff reductions. That is to say, the service has been reduced in one way or another by perhaps 4,000 people, and their annual salaries are lumped into that \$18,000,000. Also the practice of paying for overtime in cash has been temporarily suspended in most cases; the saving there is included in the \$18,000,000. Also in the case of some staffs the working time has been reduced; the number of hours of work in a day has been reduced and the pay has been cut proportionately, and that saving is included in the \$18,000,000. And also a saving of something like \$800,000 per annum by withholding the statutory increases is included. So that the amount which remains as the saving on account of promotions is really a very small item; but the figure we had quoted to us was, as I remember it, about \$480,000, and which figure we were inclined to dispute because when we checked it up we found out that included certain reclassification of positions which had been stricken from the estimates when the order first came out. We are not, of course, asking for the moment that the practice of reclassifying the positions upwards be gone ahead with; that is a different proposition altogether, but the money was lumped in, so that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any estimate. Last year the Civil Service Commission reports that 146 promotions were made. I think it is fair to say that these promotions would not involve a salary increase of more than say \$150 apiece on the average.

It would be a sum of say around \$20,000, \$21,000 or \$22,000 for the year. Now, in addition there were quite a number of positions left unfilled or definitely abolished. People were given duties to perform, but they were not even

given promotion in any capacity. So if promotions were gone ahead with, on a modified scale, a fair estimate would be probably \$50,000 to \$60,000 per annum.

The point we should like to submit to the committee, Mr. Chairman, is that while the stopping of those promotions constitutes a saving of say \$60,000 per annum, that may not be particularly good economy inasmuch as civil servants are only human; and while I would be the last to say or think that if promotions are not gone ahead with, that any civil servant would consciously impair his efficiency, nevertheless, it is a recognized thing with all employees that a fair and reasonable promotional system, curtailed, if you like, when conditions are bad, is a pretty good incentive to keep up people's spirits and to keep people working in the prospect that in one, two or three years hence, there may be some monetary recognition to them. Even to interfere with that trend of promotion, at least to stop them practically during the period of a couple of years, is a fairly serious matter, as far as that feature of the morale of the civil servants is concerned.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You do not limit it to that. There is the effect upon superannuation later on.—A. There is the effect upon superannuation, of course, to the individual because he is not getting the salary. He is not paying the contribution, as his average salary is computed, and it is that much less. But it is equitable after considerable money has been spent in drawing up a classification, and that classification has been in effect now for about 15 years, and one can reasonably assume that the classification is fair. It is inequitable to classify people fortuitously, as has been done at the present time in some instances; because when a vacancy occurs, a person is just put in to do the work without regard to the position's classification. He just has to carry on and do the work, and he may be receiving a salary attached to one grade lower, and in some cases two grades lower.

Q. An acting lance-corporal without pay?—A. Yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Of course, Mr. Phelan, that has been done and is being done throughout this country in almost all walks of life and in all stages of business?—A. Well, we appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the financial difficulties. They certainly make it a serious proposal for a minister charged with the responsibility of trying to balance budgets when money is scarce. However, our submission on this is that the sum of money is relatively small, and that there are certain principles involved, and even when money is scarce, some things are held to be essential expenditures. In addition to that, as I pointed out before, one might expect that some of the vacancies, as occurring, would be abolished. That is always the case, more particularly now when money is so scarce; but a general rule is seeping, and if continued indefinitely for say five or six years, will have the effect, in many branches of the service, of grading down all the people of that particular branch. They would all move down with the grade; as those on the top moved out the other people would move up and take over the duties but would not receive the pay which would normally pertain to the duties.

Q. Of course, there is little possibility of anything like that happening at the moment, of it running five or six years?—A. Well, I just mentioned that, Mr. Bowman because if that would be the result in five years' time, then say in two years' time the result is proportionately serious.

Q. It would depend, of course, to a considerable extent on the matter of filling positions that became vacant?—A. Well—

Q. It would depend, of course, to a considerable extent on the matter of filling positions that became vacant, just how much the general service had been

overmanned. The committee sitting two years ago felt there was duplication and overlapping of services. Possibly that has been rectified to a very considerable extent since then?—A. Well, as far as that is concerned if there were some close scrutiny given to vacancies as they develop, by the Civil Service Commission or some competent party, with the right to say "Yes," or "No" as to whether the position would be filled, that would be one thing. That is not something that we would take exception to; but when the rule is, automatically a position becomes vacant it is abolished although the work continues, and somebody else has to carry it on, it is a little different proposition. Then, there is the tendency on the part of some departments, which may already be observed, when they know a promotion is not to be made, they just carry on and do not even bother to recommend a new promotion; the position goes by the board, and somebody one or two grades down has the job to do, and it is done, and that is all there is about it.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The government gets the benefit of the better work and the individual does not get the benefit of the pay?—A. That is what it means, too; and of course, as far as the service being overclassified is concerned, well the classifications we have to-day, the important elements of it, date back to 1919, and adjustments were made at that time when the salaries were arrived at, to take account of the prospective cost of living.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You were not speaking of any overclassification?—A. No. It is a fact that those salaries were fixed on a theoretical, rather than an actual or a factual cost-of-living basis.

Q. May there not be some difficulty in your suggestion that promotions be made on a modified scale? If you change the rule at all, have you not to change it and make it apply to all positions?—A. Well, no.

Q. And make the promotions and increases automatic, and so forth?—A. Well, not necessarily.

Q. Would the service be satisfied with a close scrutiny being made of each vacancy, and if that particular vacancy warranted a promotion and increase in salary, that it would be granted by more or less a selective method.—A. Exactly. It had been the thought of the committee two years ago, that there might be some other accounting in the service, at least, I take it, relative to the volume of work.

Q. The service by and large?—A. Yes, certainly. So long as there is no ground for suspicion in the matter, nobody could take any exception to vacancies being more closely scrutinized to see whether they are necessary or not, and if it is held, they are necessary, then we submit in all equity, the promotion should be gone ahead with and should carry the promotional salary. The promotions would not cost, in any event, over a period of two or three years, what they would normally cost, for the reason the statutory increases are not being given. It is only a case of putting the person at the minimum of the grade. A person put at the minimum of the grade two years ago, in fact, three years ago, is still there. So that the only financial increase would be the increase to the minimum of the grade.

There is of course, the item of the status of the individual. Very frequently even the acting promotion means a little something to the person affected, even if he does not get the salary. It increases his status, and that sort of thing; puts him in line for the bigger increase at such time as finances improve.

Q. I can quite readily see the unfairness of the position in which a man is being put, if he is moved up to a higher position, does the work and does not

get the increase the position would warrant?—A. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we have made some inquiries as best we could, and we have failed to discover one private concern that has stopped promotions. The larger private concerns, such as banks, and so on, have carried their promotions along. They have, of course, as has been done in the civil service, curtailed in other ways. From inquiries we have made, it would seem to be indicative that where promotions are necessary they are made just as they would be in normal times.

Q. Yes, but the overhead of industry in the matter of salaries during the difficult years, 1931, 1932 and 1933 were cut tremendously.—A. Yes, of course. Likewise the service.

Mr. MACINNIS: I do not think that was true of the tobacco trade.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No.

The WITNESS: It varies with the nature of the work and with the interests. For example, right down the street is a large insurance company, the Canadian head office, and they haven't cut salaries.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Of course, life insurance business has been particularly prosperous.

The WITNESS: Well of course that is the investment department of the insurance business. They do not all admit that the sale—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The sale of insurance?

The WITNESS: Yes.—

Mr. MACINNIS: And the lapses.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Proportionately I do not think that there have been so many lapses.

Mr. MACINNIS: You do not scrutinize the returns very closely. The lapses have been more than the sales.

The WITNESS: Nevertheless, we do not claim that the inquiries which we have made are at all comprehensive; yet we have failed to discover evidence that private business has curtailed the promotions, while admitting that they have curtailed in other ways. That, Mr. Chairman, is what we have to say on that subject, and while we realize it is a matter of government policy—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: And a matter of money?

The WITNESS: And a matter of money, yet we realize that there are other considerations of principle, and as the sum of money would not be large, we sincerely hope that the committee might be able to use its good offices to do something about it.

I might say that there is another way of going about it, Mr. Chairman, and that is if some sum of money were arbitrarily decided upon, say \$50,000, promotions might be effected as far as that would go in a fiscal year, and then promotions might be held up following that point. That would at least rectify a part of the situation.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Would not there be a stampede for the \$50,000?

The WITNESS: No, because in the first place, it would depend upon vacancies occurring, and unless you killed the man who was in the position ahead of you, you could not very well be in on the stampede, unless there happened to be a vacancy there.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A lot of the promotions have been made but the increased salary not paid?

The WITNESS: Those 146 to which I referred, yes. Acting promotions, they call them, when a man is given the job but not the salary. Then, there are those promotions that have been made outright. These are chiefly senior executive positions.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. They are not numerous?—A. No, and there is the third class, where a vacancy is abolished almost, I might say, regardless of whether the work continues in the same form or not, and where nothing is done about it. The situation might be rectified some years hence, but once a job is wiped off the slate, even in good times, it is not easy to have it reestablished. That has been the experience.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. How are promotions made, by Orders in Council?—A. By the Civil Service Commission, and I believe the Civil Service Commission either in particular cases or in a general way, has to secure at least the tacit consent of the Treasury Board to make the promotion.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Are they not made on the recommendation of the deputy of the department?—A. Yes. The department asks the commission to make the promotion, but as far as determining whether the money may be paid or not, it is up to the Treasury Board, and even as far as making the acting promotion is concerned, whether any money is involved, as we understand it, the commission must have regard to the Treasury Board's regulations in that respect, which tie them up pretty tight.

Q. There certainly would be no question in regard to the matter at all, Mr. Phelan, if it were not a question of money?—A. Well, we realize that; but as I said when opening the subject, Mr. Bowman, we sometimes think that those who may have been responsible for recommending this procedure failed to realize in advance just exactly what it meant and what was implied by it.

MR. CHEVRIER: How far reaching it was?

WITNESS: Yes.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Particularly over two years.

WITNESS: Particularly for two years. If it were going to be only one year, it would not be so serious, but as it has been in effect for two, and now it is practically into the third, it makes the effect rather serious.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do you not think a better way would be to investigate each vacancy, as each vacancy occurred, and if it was found that the position was not necessary, abolish it rather than have the position and not fill it?—A. Yes. Of course, that is supposed to be done even in the very best of times. There is supposed to be some check up on vacancies as they occur, to determine whether it is necessary to continue them, and where the position is patently unnecessary, nobody would object to its being abolished.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is what the commission has been doing all along, in co-operation with departments?—A. Exactly.

Q. That is the better way to do it?—A. Yes, and with the depression on, one would expect they might be a little more rigid.

There is of course, the other type of promotion to which I referred before, namely, reclassifying positions, which of course has gone by the board. That class has been out of the picture for a matter of about four years. That is a case where the work of a department or branch changes, where consequently the work of the individual changes, and where under the classification, he

might reasonably expect to receive higher remuneration. There has been no recognition whatever of that kind given now for a matter of about four years, since, I think, around April or May of 1930. Shall I proceed on this item?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Neill, the member of parliament for Comox-Alberni, mentioned a point this morning which we wish to deal with. That is, something which affects the holidays of certain government employees who are not under the Civil Service Act. The Chairman said, that as those employees were not under the Act, the committee would not really be able to do anything on the subject. I refer particularly to the ships' officers with the Marine department. We have complaints from ships' officers from St. John and Halifax notably, and from some other points as well. And although those officers have been in the service for several years and although for many years they were given annual vacation, in 1932 the privilege of a vacation was withdrawn from them. Previously to that time it had not been legal. They had been getting it for years, but apparently there was no legal foundation for the leave being given. More recently we have had complaints from some employees of another department at Winnipeg. These employees have been in the service too for about 25 years, and they too, are now denied any leave at all, although during all those 25 years they were receiving leave. The reason given there again is that there is no legal basis for the giving of leave; that it was just done as a matter of practice, and the auditor general could not permit of such a thing being gone on with without some statutory or Order in Council authority.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Do you know who found it out?—A. Well, yes. It came up in a rather peculiar way. As far as the ships' officers are concerned, it came up in this way. A man met with an accident, and was being given some compensation under the government employees' compensation act; and when he applied for the difference between his regular salary and his compensation, the question was referred to the Justice Department, and they found out he was not entitled to leave anyway, so that he could not be given any pay.

Q. The Justice Department, of course, have to interpret the law; but we have those anomalies at all times, those technicalities and there is no necessity for them, and no reason why they should not be cleared up. Once we hear of them, I think we ought to clear them up.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think we have authority to deal with anything outside of the Civil Service Act. Our reference is:

To inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, with instructions to inquire into and report concerning the repeal or amendment of any of the provisions of the said Act, or the substitution therefor, or addition thereto of other provisions. . . .

And these people certainly do not come under the jurisdiction of the act. I do not think we have any authority to deal with the matter.

The WITNESS: They have asked us to ask that they be brought under the Act.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. They are in the government service?—A. They are in the government service, yes, but they are not civil servants.

Q. They are in the government service?—A. Yes.

Q. Paid by the government service?—A. Yes.

Q. And doing government work?—A. Yes.

Q. They crave the privilege to come in, and if we can bring them in, we ought to see that these difficulties are obviated?—A. They would be, if they were brought under the Civil Service Act.

Q. I think it is quite proper that they should be brought in.—A. At the same time I understand that the Canada Shipping Act provides that these ships' officers shall not be under the Civil Service Act. They are named on the departmental authority. I think the reason for putting that clause in the Canada Shipping Act was that these ships' officers are engaged on terms similar to those which obtain under private employment. The officers must have their regular papers which that particular type of ships' officers requires. That was the reason. The fact is these men have been in the government service for years and years, and have received leave in some cases for 20 and 25 years. Now the leave is stopped, and really it is stopped on a technicality. That is what it amounts to. So these officers ask that their case be considered with a view to bringing them under the Civil Service Act. Now, the employees of the other department whom I mentioned, their case would be dealt with if those long term temporaries were brought under the Act. That would rectify matters so far as they are concerned.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. How many are in those groups?—A. Honestly, I have not got those figures; I forgot to bring it with me. It would affect the ships' officers in the Marine Department, on the east and west coasts, and there would be some on the St. Lawrence, some at Father Point, and some at Quebec.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I do not see why some of those superior ships' officers could not continue to be appointed in the way they are now, but at the same time enjoy the privileges of the Civil Service Act. Although it might be very difficult for the Commission or any other body to appoint, say, a captain of a ship, I think it could be got around. One might appoint an ordinary clerk, and probably he might be rejected by the deputy minister, but if he were not rejected he would not wreck the whole of the department. But if you had a ships' captain who had been appointed in a competitive examination, he might leave his ship on the shoals, wreck the ship and lose a lot of lives.—A. On the other hand, he would be required to have his papers and he would be required to be a qualified officer.

Q. That is why the department feel they ought to appoint him?—A. I think that was the reason they felt that.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. We are having a new shipping act come before the House, and these gentlemen perhaps might make representations to the proper authorities to have the Act changed.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Please do not change that, it is 588 pages now.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What is another page or two?

WITNESS: In any event, if that clause were stricken out of the Shipping Act, I think these ships' officers would still be left high and dry, because they have never been put under the Civil Service Act, and I do not think they would automatically come under the Civil Service Act.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have noted your representations on their behalf.

WITNESS: I might say too, that these ships' officers are regarded as being paid on prevailing rates, by reason of the fact their salaries are recited in terms of months, not of years, and consequently they are not under the Civil Service Superannuation Act. That is another grievance which they have, and one which, it would seem had a good deal of merit in it, a good deal of cause for complaint.

On the subject of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, Mr. Chairman, I understand this committee proposes to secure, if possible, the views of the Advisory Committee of the Civil Service Superannuation Act. There are only two points in particular in connection with the Act, points which do not involve any technical features of the Act, but which involve rather, other considerations, and which I would like to deal with now.

First of all, when the Act was originally passed, those who were in the civil service at the time it became effective, and who were otherwise eligible to come under it were given three years in which to elect to come under the Act. If they failed to do so before the three years were up, then they did not have any further opportunity. Later on, early in May, 1927, the Act was reopened a second time and a further period of some three or four months was given, up to the 19th July, 1927, for those employees to elect to come under the Act. Now, whether it is due to the somewhat natural perversity of human nature, or whether it was due to more or less bad advice, I do not know, but some hundreds of civil servants failed to elect to come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act—some thousands in fact. It has been argued, when we have asked that the Act be reopened, that these people had their chance, and they did not take advantage of it, and therefore they are out definitely and positively. I suppose as far as the facts of the case are concerned, that view has some justification; but there are some other features to it which we believe would warrant reconsideration for reopening the Act.

First of all, there were those points which I have just referred to, namely: some people were advised by others whose advice they should not have taken but whose advice they did take; there were people who misunderstood the Act; they did not read it through, or reading it through did not understand it; there were people who were careless perhaps, fairly new in the service. In the odd instance, not many but in a few instances, they did not know of the fact that there was an Act, or it was not called to their attention, and although it was a very serious thing for them to fail to elect to come under the Act they did fail. Then times are somewhat changed, changed temporarily at any rate, possibly permanently in some respects; and conditions which existed in 1924, 1925 and 1926 have not disappeared. For instance, at that time any person who was under the old retirement fund had some right to assume that he would be allowed to continue in the civil service until he reached the age of 75. However, during recent years, due to some extent to changes in outside conditions, and also due to some extent to a change which has come over people's minds moves have been made to retire people at an earlier age than 75, with the result that to-day a great many are being asked to retire at the age of 65. Ten years ago if they had known that they would be required to retire at the age of 65, a great many of them no doubt would have come under the Superannuation Act.

Also at the time that those people failed to elect to come under the Superannuation Act and remained under the old retirement fund, the rate of interest paid on the old retirement fund was 5 per cent compounded either annually or semi-annually, I think semi-annually, but nevertheless it was 5 per cent. As of last July 1st that rate of interest was reduced to 4 per cent by Order in Council. The Governor in Council has the right, under the old retirement fund legislation, to reduce the rate of interest from 5 per cent. It might be reduced to 4 per cent or 3 per cent as the Governor in Council saw fit. I suppose outside financial conditions is what determined the government on that change. Nevertheless when these people failed to elect to come under the Superannuation Act 5 per cent had been the prevailing rate of interest on that retirement fund for a matter of some ten years or so, and with, I suppose some reason, they thought that 5 per cent rate would continue. Now, over a long term of years that 1 per cent reduction in interest in a man's savings makes quite a difference, and if these

men have thought that that rate of interest would be changed then we submit a good many who did not take advantage of the Superannuation Act would have taken advantage of it.

Mr. LAURIN: That point is very important.

The WITNESS: Well, it is extremely important to those who are affected, because after all a person's old age is very important to him, and if he has not made provision for it in his earlier years well, of course, he is just out of luck when he gets old. So that we feel, while the argument might be put up that these people had ample opportunity, or at least had considerable opportunity to come under the Act, the fact is that many of them did not take advantage of that opportunity, and we submit the mistake should not be held against them indefinitely.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you know how many there are concerned?—A. Well, there are still contributing to the old retirement fund something like 5,000 people. Not quite all, but most of them would be eligible to come under the Superannuation Act. There would be a few others as well who would be eligible, but who were not contributing to that old retirement fund, but they would not take advantage of it. At the same time though, judging by the large number of requests we have received on this, I am ready to believe that 90 per cent who are out would come under the Act. I have not checked the figures up lately, but I did check them about two or three years ago, and at that time something like 30 per cent of the service, of the Post Office service outside of the city of Ottawa were not under the Superannuation Act. I am speaking, of course, of those who had an opportunity to come under but failed to come under, and something like 30 per cent still remained out.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. And there were a few hundred in Montreal?—A. A lot of them there.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. And those who remained out were under the retirement fund?—A. Yes, most of them of the Post Office Department.

Q. You say there are approximately 5,000?—A. Well, I am speaking off-hand, but that is my recollection of it, yes.

Q. Now, say 90 per cent of these would come under the Superannuation Act what would happen to the retirement fund, would that be transferred to the Superannuation Fund?—A. Yes. If those people were given the opportunity to elect to come under the Superannuation Act and came under, they would have to transfer their holdings, their savings in the retirement fund to the superannuation fund. They would just pay the same cost of contribution, but they would transfer their money, what they had already accumulated.

Q. Are those to whom you are referring now civil servants under the Civil Service Act?—A. Oh yes, with one or two minor exceptions. I should not perhaps say minor, but there would be a few in, say, Income Tax, who had the right to elect and who failed to exercise it, and if the Act were reopened they would get the right. Now they are not under the Civil Service Act, but in the main these people I speak of are under the Civil Service Act.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Do you think that about 5,000 would be the maximum?—A. Yes, the figure is given in the public accounts. I have not got it with me but that is my recollection that it is 5,000—just under 5,000.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Well, what would be the steps necessary to be taken to allow these people to come in?—A. Well, that would be very simple. The Act provides, or the Act did provide originally that up to a certain date people might elect to come in. Well, it is only a matter of amending the Act to provide a later date. Suppose it were determined to make it 6 months or a year, the date would simply be changed up to 19th July, 1935, or whatever date was selected.

Q. Does the government contribute to the retirement fund on the same basis as it does to the Superannuation Fund?—A. It just pays interest on it, it is just a saving fund.

Q. And has the government the use of the fund the whole time?—A. Oh well, they have never used it. It is carried as a bookkeeping account, there is no fund. I mean, it is not on the gold standard, but it is an obligation of the government and, in that sense, it is just as sound as Victory bonds.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. They have placed 5 per cent, or have been placing 5 per cent to the credit of the account each year?—A. Now 4 per cent. It is just the same sort of obligation as a Victory bond would be, and no civil servant has any apprehension about it.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. But the government could use that money and pay the interest, the same as it would on any other loan?—A. It does actually, yes; it is that much less cash which has to be found to meet the payroll and then it is charged up as an obligation; that is perfectly true.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. There is this point though, Mr. Phelan, that if the transfer was made from the retirement fund to the Superannuation Fund to bring these people under the Superannuation Act, then the Government would be involved because they would have to pay dollar for dollar?—A. Afterwards, yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But not before?—A. No.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. No, but as soon as the transfer were made.—A. From that time on in respect of contributions made, the government would pay, that is true.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. It is the same thing that happened in the original plan when the civil service brought in about \$13,000,000 from the retirement fund and then the government started to pay 5 per cent just as the civil servants paid 5 per cent?—A. Yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. But they would bring across with them the amount of savings that they had in the retirement fund?—A. Yes, they would bring that with them.

Q. They would bring that across with them?—A. Yes.

Q. And then they would simply go on under the Superannuation Act as though they had been paying into it the number of years that they had paid into the retirement fund?—A. Exactly. It would be making their coming under the Act retroactive, as was done in the case of the thousands of people who before came under the retirement fund.

Q. The only difference in effect would be the additional money which the government would have to put up from time to time?—A. In the future.

Q. In the future?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Do you mean the government would be obliged to pay on what they transferred?—A. Oh no, it would be from the date of transfer. That is what was done before when the Act was reopened the second time. The government started paying after people had stated their intention of changing over. Some may have transferred over two years before others, but the government did not start to pay in on account of any particular individual until that individual elected to come under the Act.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. As a matter of practice how is it done, that is, the government end of it?—A. The government pays in each year or credits the fund with an amount equal to that contributed by civil servants in the fiscal year.

Q. Yes, that is the way I thought it was handled.—A. They have to wait till the end of the year to find out exactly what it was, and they pay it in the next year.

Q. Have you done any figuring at all, Mr. Phelan, to show what the additional charge to the government would be in the event, say, of 4,000 of these people being transferred from the retirement fund and coming under the Superannuation Act; have you any figures to show what it would cost the government?—A. No. It would not, in so far as the government is concerned, add to the cost any more than approximately one-sixth additional. There are about 25,000 contributors at the present time, and if 4,000 transfer over that would increase it by about one-sixth.

Q. What was the government's contribution last year?—A. The government's contribution at the present time, as I remember it, runs about \$2,200,000.

Q. So that the transfer from the retirement fund to the Superannuation Act would entail an additional annual expenditure by the government of say \$3,500,000?—A. No, one-sixth of \$2,200,000.

Q. Oh yes, \$360,000?—A. That is quite right. I think my figure of \$2,200,000 is approximately right.

Q. I just want to get it approximately so that we can see.—A. It may be out a little; but, on the other hand, of course, there is this to be said about it, that that \$2,200,000 represents certain contributions that the government is making to-day in respect of 25,000 civil servants, and what we are asking for, as far as the other 4,000 or 5,000 are concerned, is just the same provision. True, they refused it once, but nevertheless we are asking for it again at this late date.

Q. Of course, it makes a difference whether you ask it in prosperous times or hard times. I mean the government, any government to-day would naturally hesitate adding any further material amount to its annual expenditures?—A. Well yes, of course, that is quite right. At the same time, this is not altogether like a cash obligation.

Q. Well yes, it is.—A. It is a bookkeeping obligation.

Q. It is actually money that they are going to have to pay out each year, additional money?—A. Well no, it is just bookkeeping account, crediting the fund with that much money.

Q. Yes, but eventually it is paid out?—A. Oh yes, eventually, but I mean immediately though; it is not in that category; it is not a cash obligation, not an immediate cash obligation.

Q. This is not a new social credit scheme at all.—A. Oh, no. This is a very serious problem to those who are getting near the retiring age.

Another class in connection with superannuation whose case we would like to bring to your attention, is that class known as prevailing rates employees. Now, the position of the prevailing rate employees is somewhat different to the class of civil servants to whom I was referring just before, because prevailing rate employees never had the right to come under the Civil Service Superannuation Act. These prevailing rate employees, to the number, I believe, of about 1,500, are distributed among some five or six departments. Public Works has quite a considerable number; Public Printing and Stationery, that is, the printing bureau, has quite a considerable number. The Department of Marine has quite a number, as also have Railways and Canals and National Defence; and Mines has a few. These employees, I should mention are, as to some of them located in Ottawa and others are distributed throughout the country.

The distinction between employees paid at prevailing rates of pay and other government employees of the distinction which caused prevailing rate employees to be kept out from under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, is that they are not paid at what the Act defines as a stated annual salary. A civil servant to come under the Superannuation Act must be permanent, and he must be paid a stated annual salary of not less than \$600 a year. Now, that has been interpreted to mean this: that if a man's rate of pay is struck not on a yearly basis but on a monthly basis, or a weekly basis, or a daily basis, or an hourly basis he is automatically disbarred or debarred, whichever you wish, from coming under the Superannuation Act. Usually, these paid on hourly, daily or weekly rates are mechanical employees, but that is not the distinction. If a mechanical employee is paid on an annual basis he comes under the Superannuation Act, or if a clerk is paid a daily basis he is not under the Superannuation Act regardless of the length of time that he may have been in the civil service. These prevailing rate employees did, in some cases, ask to be allowed to come under the Act when first the Act was considered by a committee of parliament. However, their request was not granted, and in the ten years which have elapsed since 1924 they have repeatedly asked to be brought under the Act, but always without result.

Mr. Neill this morning was mentioning telegraph operators. We have had many complaints from that class, and there is a class of employee whose rate is fixed on a monthly basis, and if those same employees had had their rate determined on a yearly basis they would be under the Act. Ships' officers the same. Printers in the printing bureau here are paid on a weekly basis. Well, if when their rates were struck they had been quoted in terms of a year presumably they would have come under the Act.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. It is pretty difficult to see why they do not, some of them anyway?—A. Well, yes, but it is just for that reason, that the interpretation of the phrase "stated annual salary", that that means that a salary must be stated in terms of a year. A man might be getting \$2,000, but if it is called \$40 a week that is not a stated annual salary.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And the fact is, in most of these positions, such as the elevator men and charwomen, the prevailing rate has not fluctuated at all in the last few years. Take, for instance, the case of the charwomen; they are paid at prevailing rates, and some of them have been here for 25 and 30 years, but if they are paid prevailing rates those rates have practically never changed, except when they got a small increase which might have been called something in the nature of a statutory increase of some kind?—A. Oh yes, that is true.

Q. You will remember the difficulty we had in 1924 when we had this Act up, and that was Mr. Finlayson's great difficulty to bring these people in; he

wanted a stated annual salary and a yearly rate of pay to most of them, that is what they get now; there is no fluctuation in their rate of pay although they say that they are prevailing rates.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It has become a custom.

The WITNESS: In any event, at the time the annual increases are being given to the classified civil servants of a person gets into a new class he is put at the minimum of that class, and each year is given the increase; and as far as bookkeeping is concerned, you have got to change each year his contribution to the Superannuation Fund if his salary changes that often. On the other hand, none of these prevailing rates would fluctuate very much within a year, and, in many cases, they will remain fixed for years and years. As far as that goes, in some cases these prevailing rate employees, take in the Public Works Department, in the case of mechanics there, apart altogether from the 10 per cent salary cut they have had their rates reduced in the last three years by reason of the fact that the outside prevailing rate has dropped, and so far as bookkeeping is concerned there is no difficulty there at all.

Q. That is really not a vital objection.—A. It really has nothing to do with the case except with the bookkeeping. These people, as I said, never had a chance to come under the Act, and we believe that if the Act is a good thing for the 25,000 employees who are under it that it would be just as proper aid fit for those 1,500 or so prevailing rate employees to be allowed to come under the Act.

Q. And there quite a large number of them who have been in the government employ for from ten to twenty years.—A. In most cases their length of service would compare with the length of service of any class of employees. For example, in the case of the maintenance staff of the Department of Public Works in the City of Ottawa here you can see that the employees have been in the service, some of them up to about 40 years.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. How many employees are concerned in the Public Works?—A. In the Public Works, well, there would be a total of around about 600, both in Ottawa and outside.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. And the Printing Bureau?—A. The Printing Bureau has around 400.

Q. Marine?—A. The Marine Department has about 150.

Q. Railways and Canals?—A. Railways and Canals has around about 125.

Q. National Defence?—A. National Defence has about 250. Mines Department has a few, I think about 25, if I am not mistaken.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. There were a number of men let out from the Printing Bureau, last year?—A. Yes, those who were over 65 years of age. Of course, the same general regulation applied to all these branches; if they were over 65 years of age they were released.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I can see a difficulty in this committee bringing in a recommendation of this kind unless we had representations from each of these departments. I suppose there is a great deal of variety between classes of employment, changes in the prevailing rates of pay, and so forth?—A. Well, of course.

Q. It is quite a problem in itself?—A. At the same time, there is a variation between the salary conditions and employment, and so on, amongst those

who are already under the Superannuation Act?—A. Oh, quite true. They are not all of the one class.

Q. I am aware of that, but I mean in order that we may make a recommendation, for instance, that certain groups should be brought under the Superannuation Act we should know something about that particular group or groups. We could hardly make a general recommendation just on the representations or general statements that have been submitted to us to-day, but your idea is to give us the general picture?—A. Oh, yes, it is to call attention to the problem.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Is there anybody who could give us the exact figure?

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. I suppose you could get representatives from the various departments, the employees of the various departments, say from the Printing Bureau?—A. I presume so.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Could you get the information, Mr. Phelan?—A. I could secure accurate figures. It will take a few days, but I could get accurate figures from the departments. If you wish I will get them.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I think it would be a good idea to file them.—A. Those figures I gave, of course, are approximate. I might be in error in the case of some departments one way or another but I think, in a general way, they are fairly accurate.

Q. How long has this difficulty been running? I suppose for years?—A. Well, ever since the Superannuation Act came into force. There was the Calder Act, which was a sort of emergency retirement measure passed about the close of the war, passed at a time when there had not been any Superannuation Act in effect for twenty years, and prevailing rates employees were treated on the same footing as the other employees under the Calder Act, by amendment passed; they were not covered under the Act as it stood originally, but the Act was subsequently amended and prevailing rates employees were then treated on the same footing as anybody else under that Act. That, of course, was a non-contributory scheme.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. These employees are not paying into any fund at the present time?—A. A very few of them do pay into that old retirement fund, but in the main they do not pay into any fund at all.

Q. And on retirement do they receive any gratuity?—A. Well, right now, if they are retired by reason of being over age 65, they are given a gratuity not to exceed six months pay. That is rated on their length of service. If they have not been in the service five years they do not get anything, but if they are in the service between five years and twelve years they are given one month's pay for each two years service.

Q. You remember there was a large number let out some two years ago, some eighty, who received no gratuity at all, and some of them had service extending up to twenty years?—A. I was going to come to that. And speaking of the case of the Printing Bureau, the Secretary of State, speaking in the House of Commons this session referred to them, stating that while it had been proposed to cut the staff of the Printing Bureau, as Minister in charge of the department it had given him a great deal of concern. I think he said he lost a couple of nights sleep, if I am not mistaken; he was rather concerned about the condition of the men who would be thrown out of employment by that move.

That, I think Mr. Chairman, concludes that point. I will file with the committee these figures which I mentioned, in the course of say, a week. Will that be satisfactory?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MacINNIS: We may call you again if we have anything further to ask you.

WITNESS: I will be glad to come. I may say, that these two suggestions we have advanced under the heading of superannuation, relate to the extension of the act to people not now under the act. We have some suggestions that we would advance with respect to changes in the act, changes in the openings and methods of computing service and so on, and if it is agreeable to the committee, I shall file our proposed amendments to the act, rather than take up the time to discuss them, because I understood the Chairman to say this morning it was proposed to call somebody from the Advisory Committee of the Superannuation Act, at which time, I presume, our proposals along with others, will be heard. I shall file those with the clerk of the committee.

There have been sent in to the committee, some memoranda from groups either now associated with the Federation, or who were previously associated with it, groups who have asked us to call attention to their memoranda, and I should like now briefly to carry out their wishes in that regard.

Mr. Chevrier referred to certain employees who were released from the Department of Public Works a couple of years ago in the city here, to the number of about 82 men, regardless of their length of service with the department, and their length of service ran well up to forty years in some cases. These men were released without being paid any gratuity or, of course, without receiving any annuity or any superannuation at the time the department notified these men that their services would be no longer required. We interviewed the Hon. Mr. Stewart, the Minister of Public Works, urging that at least some emergency gratuity be provided to tide these men over for a little while until they could look around and secure some other work, if it could be found, and so on. While the minister received us very sympathetically and considered the point, unfortunately nothing was done about it at the time. These men have filed a memorandum with the committee, pointing out the facts concerning their release two years ago, and they asked that the Superannuation Act be opened in the case of employees paid at prevailing rates, because they themselves were paid under that system, and although they had been out of the service for two years, they asked that they be allowed to come under that act. I call attention to their representations in that regard, although I must say that as far as the Federation is concerned, we just pass that on to the committee without comment. As far as we are concerned, we are not commenting upon their requests in that regard. I would however point out that the Federation did try two years ago to secure for these men some gratuity, and that is something that we feel even at this late date might be done, and we would urge that the committee be good enough to look into the question to see if it would not be possible to do something.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Are they under the Civil Service Commission?—A. No, they are not. They were in exempt positions.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. There are some others, probably 35 or 50 who were let out last year under different conditions?—A. In addition there were released starting with about the first day of September, last, those reaching the age of 65, and those who were let out by reason of reaching 65 were paid the gratuity that was already mentioned here to-day. Now, those 82 who went out in April 1932,

regardless of age, or regardless of length of service, did not get that gratuity, but we asked the Minister of Public Works to recommend at the time, and as I say, he showed some sympathy with the proposal when we discussed it with him that some gratuity arrangement like that be asked for as an emergency measure. The other request about bringing them under the Superannuation Act, although without the service, is one that we passed along, and one which is advanced by those employees themselves, the Elevator Operators' Association consisting of elevator operators in Ottawa.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What do you mean by elevator operators, building elevator operators?—

A. Yes. They file, likewise, a memorandum with the committee, and we have been asked to refer to it. The first section of that memorandum deals with the matter of salaries and classifications of the elevator operators.

Mr. LAURIN: Here in the city of Ottawa?

The WITNESS: Here, and in the other public buildings in Ottawa. When the elevator operators spoke to us on that subject, we pointed out to them that we understood the chairman to announce that the question affecting salaries and classifications was not to be gone into by this committee. Was that correct?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: My recollection is that is what the chairman intimated.

The WITNESS: We pointed that out to the elevator operators. In any event, their representations are contained in their letter, so I am just calling attention to it. They have other grievances which are dealt with in their communication.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I believe they intend to appear before the committee.

The WITNESS: Do they?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I heard that indirectly.

The WITNESS: I see. Well, if that is the case, I will leave the point.

Mr. CHEVRIER: No.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It is all right to go ahead. I might have been incorrectly informed, but I understood that they had purposed attending the committee.

The WITNESS: Well, one point they deal with, and which I would like to call to the attention of the committee particularly, is that relating to their inspection and supervision. These employees come under the Public Works department, and they are under the supervision of officials of the department, and I believe that the officer of that department who supervises them has some other duties to perform as well as supervising the elevator operators.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: They claim there is not sufficient supervision, if I remember correctly?

The WITNESS: That is it, exactly.

Mr. MACINNIS: No supervision between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.

The WITNESS: They claim if they were more closely supervised by somebody, more specifically, I should say, that it would mean a smoother working out of their working conditions, which would avoid certain complications due to hours, arrangements, and so on. That is a point, and if the committee feels disposed to give it consideration, I would certainly suggest it is one that might be considered with a view to seeing whether some more satisfactory arrangement could not be worked out. Some time ago they took up that point with the department, but the department was not disposed to do anything about it. However, it might be possible now to have that straightened out. One group who came to see the Federation to ask that we further their representations, consisted of some

five watchmen employed by the Public Works Department in Ottawa. These men were appointed by the Civil Service Commission some five years ago, and after passing competitive examinations—I forget whether all of them are returned soldiers or not, but I know some are—they complain that although they were qualified for permanent appointment, and although they are in permanent jobs, they have not been made permanent.

Now, I mention that point more particularly because it leads to a more general question; and that in some departments at all times, and in most departments right now, even where it might reasonably be assumed that a position will be permanent and will continue indefinitely, people are not being made permanent after suitable probationary periods are passed. Now, these are some of the matters which—

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. These are people who have passed Civil Service examinations?—A. And are appointed by the Commission. There is right now, I suppose, one might say, naturally a tendency to go very easy on making people permanent, particularly at a time when efforts are being made to reduce the service; but nevertheless where people are qualified, and where they are legally appointed, and where as far as can be determined the position will continue indefinitely, we would urge that some means might be considered and possibly suggested to speed up permanency for those people.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are some in the Militia Department.

The WITNESS: Yes, that is right. The last time this committee considered civil service matters we made certain representations touching the setting up of an appeal board, and the committee recommended favourably with regard to that matter, something I might add that we certainly appreciated very much. To date no such appeal board has functioned, and I think that possibly is due to some slight misunderstanding. We thought that some announcement would be made either by the Civil Service Commission or some other competent authority that the appeal board either was constituted or would be constituted, but I learned just to-day in discussing the matter with the Chairman of this committee, that as no request has been filed for the setting up of any appeal board nothing has been done, but that if a request is filed the appeal board will be set up. I mention this particularly lest any impression should be created that although no representations have been made asking for an appeal board that it was not thought necessary. That is not the case. And I might add, that now that the appeal board will be constituted when asked for we intend to take full advantage of it, in fact, we will have to take full advantage of it pretty soon, and we will show our appreciation of the recommendation of this committee by taking advantage of the machinery which they have provided.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I am not so sure, Mr. Phelan, that the Chairman went so far as to say that the board would be set up.—A. Well, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is to be an ad hoc board; I understand that is the legal phrase; it is not to be some permanent board.

Mr. MACINNIS: It has been in hock.

The WITNESS: Well, it may have been in hock for two years now but we are going to try to get it out.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I do not know that the necessary machinery has been provided for it. Is there anything in the Act under which you could set up the board that was recommended last year?—A. Honestly, our impression was that some definite

move would have to be made, an Order in Council would have to be passed definitely creating such a board, but the Chairman of the committee told me this morning that the report had been approved by parliament and all that would be necessary would be to set up the board for any particular case which might be up for hearing.

Q. Well, I will not differ with the Chairman in his absence, but we will take your suggestion anyway.—A. We are very much interested in it, and if the machinery does not exist at the moment we would earnestly request this committee to reiterate its recommendation of two years ago.

Mr. MACINNIS: From the report made by the Civil Service Commission on the recommendations of the 1932 committee, I understand that the reason why no board has been set up was because of the harmony, equity and justice prevailing in the various departments and that there was nothing to bring before such a board.

Mr. BLAND: I hope Mr. Phelan will not disturb that situation.

The WITNESS: All I have to say to that, Mr. Chairman, is that I think this committee has received representations from individuals and small classes and large classes, and so on, on matter which may possibly be referred to such an appeal board, and certainly we have had a great number of complaints, some of which we have been accumulating hoping that this board would be set up and get down to business.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. If the board is set up you will have all the material to submit to it?—A. Oh yes, absolutely. And if the machinery as existing at the moment is not sufficient, then we would earnestly request this committee to reiterate its recommendation along that line.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word with respect to the Civil Service Act and the principle of the merit system which is embodied in that Act.

Two years ago considerable attention was given by this committee to the features of the Civil Service Act relating to appointments, and in the main the committee's report, by implication at any rate, recommended the continuation of the Civil Service Commission system and the merit system, and so forth. From time to time, during the past fifteen years, since the Civil Service Act was last changed in important respects, sections of the civil service have been left out from under the Act either by legislation or by Order in Council. That is a tendency that civil servants in the main do not like to see, because it is apt in time to have the effect of weakening the civil service and the merit system.

We wish to express the view to this committee, that in the public interest—not only in the interests of civil servants but in the public interest—the merit system and system of promotion is an essential in the civil service, and we wish to record what we believe to be the overwhelming opinion of civil servants themselves, that the merit system, as existing, should be strengthened rather than weakened.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes what we have to say from the Civil Service Federation, and I wish to thank you and the members of the committee very much for their kind attention in listening to our rather lengthy presentation.

Mr. MACINNIS: Before Mr. Phelan retires, he has put before us, I think, a very good case. He has presented it in a wonderfully clear manner, and some of the points that he has raised, I think, are of major importance, referring more particularly now of the bringing in of certain classes who are not now under the Superannuation Act, and related questions.

I think it is rather difficult for this committee, on the information they have, to give a considered opinion and make a considered recommendation, and I am

going to ask Mr. Phelan if he does not think that the better way to deal with this matter would be to have a committee appointed consisting of a member from the civil service employees, a member from the Civil Service Commission, and perhaps someone appointed by the government itself, to investigate these many matters that he has brought to our attention, and then report either to this committee or to parliament itself on the questions concerned. It would be a delay of approximately a year, but probably in the end it would be the quickest way and the most complete way to deal with the whole question.

The WITNESS: Well, do you want an expression of opinion on that?

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Yes.—A. Well, it is rather a difficult question to answer because if I say “No,” well I am saying that such a committee would not be competent to deal with the question; and if I say “Yes,” then I am saying that such a committee would be a better body to deal with such a question than a committee consisting of members of parliament.

Q. Well, you will not hurt my feelings.—A. No, but some other members of the committee might be more sensitive. I would say, however, that as far as some of the matters dealt with are concerned I would consider that the present committee should certainly, from our point of view, feel able to deal with those matters without any hesitation, because on that question of permanency, for example, the figures are available showing the numbers to be admitted, or the numbers affected. Possible expenditures even in the future can be calculated with some certainty, and in the past when changes such as that have been made, they have usually been made just on general information not as the result of intensive or, I might add, expert study as a rule.

In connection with superannuation, to take matters relating to that subject, I presume that there are reports available from studies such as you would propose, Mr. MacInnis. These questions are all of long standing, and I think that in most cases the information is readily available. And, to be perfectly frank with you, I think that this committee would be able to arrive at a very sound opinion, and probably arrive at a better opinion than such a committee as suggested, more particularly for the reason that if this committee arrives at any conclusions, or opinions, they are the opinions of disinterested parties, whereas the opinions arrived at by a committee such as suggested might be considered the opinions of people who are too close to the trees to see the woods. That has sometimes been said about committees just such as that suggested.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. MacInnis has touched upon the crux of the situation, to bring your long term temporaries and your prevailing rates employees under the Superannuation Act, but I think it is a matter we will have to deal with, but it is a question as to just how far we would be prepared to go or what evidence we shall call before us.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It resolves itself, to my mind, into two points. One is, either the principle is right or it is wrong. If the principle is right, then no matter what the cost would be under ordinary conditions the principle ought to be given effect to. Then as to the cost, if we do decide that the principle is right then the rest of it is easily ascertainable. For instance, in the case of long term employees we could get from the departments concerned the number of employees, and get from the accountants or other officers there just what the cost would be. We can discuss the principle, and if we arrive at a conclusion that the principle is right then it ought to be put into effect.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Then we will have to discuss the matter.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the way I see the situation.

Mr. MACINNIS: As far as I am concerned myself, I am perfectly satisfied. I have endeavoured to explain as best I could my feeling in the matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have all listened sympathetically to what Mr. Phelan has had to say, and I am sure I am only voicing the view of the Committee when I say that we are indebted to him for the very clear and comprehensive statement which he has given to us this afternoon on the various questions which he has brought to our attention.

STATEMENT submitted on behalf of the Civil Service Federation of Canada in reference to the Status of Employees of the Director of Soldier Settlement.

To the Chairman and Members
of the Parliamentary Committee
on Civil Service.

GENTLEMEN.—As President of the Civil Service Federation it is my duty and pleasure to submit representations to you in support of the application which has been made by the Staff of Soldier Settlement of Canada to be extended the benefits of the Superannuation Act 1924 and amendments thereto and to be included in the permanent Civil Service of Canada.

I submit the following reasons why the staff of the Department should be included in the Permanent Service and extended the benefits of the Superannuation Act:—

1. Many members of the staff have performed up to 15 years continuous, useful, public service not including war service.
2. The work of the Department must continue for at least another 20 years on the basis of specific land settlement contracts between the Department and settlers under its jurisdiction.
3. The Department was reorganized in 1931 and has been reported to Parliament as now being on an efficient business basis with reasonable administration cost. (Reference Hansard, pages 5049 and 5100 May 8th and 9th, 1933).
4. The merits of our claim for superannuation have been publicly referred to by Rt. Honourable the Prime Minister. (Reference Hansard, page 3129, May 14th, 1928).

The following information is furnished with respect to the Organization and nature of the work performed.

STAFF

This petition concerns a staff of 343 temporary employees, 251 of whom are males and 92 females. Ninety-eight per cent of the male staff are returned soldiers.

Sixty-two members of the staff are located at Head Office, Ottawa. Two hundred and eighty-one are attached to District Offices throughout the Dominion; of this number ninety-nine are fieldmen located throughout the Dominion at strategic points in the territory for which they are responsible. Seventeen members of Head Office Accounts staff were made permanent last year as part of the Treasury Staff.

The following table shows staff distribution:—

	Male	Female	Total
Head office.....	41	21	62
Vancouver.....	30	8	38
Calgary.....	28	8	36
Edmonton.....	34	13	47
Saskatoon.....	46	15	61
Winnipeg.....	25	10	35
Toronto.....	22	7	29
Sherbrooke.....	4	2	6
St. John.....	21	8	29
	251	92	343

Reorganization of the Soldier Settlement Department in 1931 resulted in retirement of 158 of the then personnel; salary cost reduction \$270,264 and the closing of three District Offices. The Organization may now fairly be said to be on a permanent basis.

ADMINISTRATION* COST

The Honourable W. A. Gordon, Minister of the Department, in dealing with administration cost of Soldier Settlement before Parliament last year stated as follows:—

“Today the cost of administration is less than one per cent (of the net investment) which compares very favourably with the cost of administration of loan companies similar business.” (Reference Hansard May 9th, 1933, page 5100).

SCOPE OF WORK

The Soldier Settlement Department conducts the work of Soldier Land Settlement under the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919 and amendments, and General Land Settlement as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. The two activities are complementary.

The value of these two phases of work being performed by one Organization was brought out in Report of the Board of Audit, October 1, 1929, page 21, under “Recommendation”:—

- (a) Resulting from our survey of the activities of the board, we have come to the conclusion that the interests of the Dominion and the ultimate realization upon its investment of over \$55,000,000 in loans and properties, will necessitate for some years, the exercise of sound judgment and careful attention to collections. The Dominion has in the Settlement organization a staff with a practical working knowledge of conditions throughout the country. As work in connection with the Soldier Settlement loans decreases every effort should be made to use this organization in the general colonization work of the Dominion.

EXTENT OF WORK

(a) Soldier and British Family Settlement.

At this date there are 22,095 farm properties under the administration of the Department representing a net public investment of \$57,100,376.31 inclusive of British Family Settlement loans.

There are:—

11,205 soldier settlers whose contracts continue until the year 1947.

5,650 “civilian settlers” (i.e., purchasers of reverted Soldier Settlement farms) whose contracts continue up to 1959.

2,182 British family settlers whose contracts extend to 1955.

There is a total of 19,037 active loans and 3,058 farms on hand for resettlement or resale.

The current accounts of settlers are covered by individual land contracts which run for a period of 25 years during which time as settlers repay their loans or as they transfer, or assign their interest, deeds, conveyances and assignments have to be drawn, approved and executed; foreclosed properties have to be resold; insurance to the extent of \$19,000,000 on farm buildings has to be carried and renewed, and security covering the entire indebtedness has to be preserved.

Work similar to that of a mortgage or lending institution has to be undertaken in connection with the administration of this public estate. The work is divided into three departments:— Accounting, Estates and Securities, and Field Supervision.

In addition to necessary supervision furnished backward settlers, the field staff is required by specific agreements with the British Government to render field supervision service to British family settlers under the Three Thousand British Family Agreement and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Scheme.

(b) General Land Settlement

The evolution of the Soldier Settlement staff from a purely Soldier Settlement Organization to its present position wherein it administers Soldier Settlement and General Land Settlement as the colonization arm of the Department of Immigration and Colonization has been gradual. Each successive step in the field of general colonization has been necessitated by actual settlement demands for practical services of a character the Department is equipped to give.

Under Orders in Council P.C. 1645, August 17th, 1923; P.C. 320, March 14th, 1927, and P.C. 698, April 14th, 1927, the administration of the Soldier Settlement Act was transferred from the Minister of the Interior and placed under the Minister of Immigration and Colonization and provision made that Soldier Settlement staff or such portion of staff as the Ministry may from time to time determine shall be designated as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Prior to 1923 the Department of Immigration and Colonization had no Land Settlement service and, therefore, existed in name only in so far as actual settlement activities were concerned.

As an indication of the work coming under the heading "General Land Settlement," the Land Settlement Branch has placed in farm employment 66,494 persons from January 1st, 1924, to December 31st, 1933.

Special reference is made to the work of the staff in connection with the Back-to-the-Land Movement instituted by the Government in the autumn of 1930. This work has taken the form of a co-ordinated effort between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Colonization Departments of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. In the period October 1st, 1930, to December 31st, 1933, a total of 94,092 persons have been absorbed into agricultural life by the three agencies mentioned and of this number the Land Settlement Branch was directly responsible for the settlement and placement of 21,427 persons.

In May, 1932, the Federal Government entered into agreement with eight Provincial Governments for settlement on land of qualified unemployed families—the Relief Settlement Plan—under which 2,701 families, including 14,358 persons, have already been settled. On the recommendation of Provincial Governments the agreements are being extended for a further two years. The Soldier Settlement staff has taken an active part in this work in all provinces. Clause 6 of the Dominion, Provincial Agreements reads as follows:—

The province shall set up an Advisory Committee upon which shall be included representatives of the Dominion Land Settlement Branch, the Colonization Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Colonization Branch of the Canadian National Railways.

(c) Services to Other Departments.

In recent years this organization has carried out rural investigations for the following Dominion Government departments:—

- (1) Department of Pensions and National Health (Relief to war pensioners).
- (2) The War Veterans Allowance Committee (Allowances to disabled veterans not eligible for pension).
- (3) The Board of Pension Commissioners (Special reports as required).
- (4) Department of Interior (Patents to soldier settler holders of Dominion Land).

The number of investigations conducted for other departments in 1932 totalled 7,110 and in 1933 the total was 6,511.

In conclusion it is submitted:—

- (a) That substantial work in Soldier Settlement must continue during the period of Soldier Settlement Agreements and Civilian Settlers' Land Agreements until the years 1947-1959.
- (b) That substantial general land settlement and colonization commitments to have been entered into with the British Government under the Three Thousand British Family and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Agreements which, as above indicated, require the services of a staff until 1955. The services of the Land Settlement Branch are required to perform the work of general colonization and settlement described.
- (c) That our usefulness as a service department has been established in connection with the rural investigations aforementioned, and that because of the saving which has obviously been made to the public treasury, such activities will doubtless be continued for many years to come.

In addition to the above considerations the staff of the Soldier Settlement of Canada urge that it be borne in mind that most of the staff have already been employed up to fifteen years and feel that they are justly entitled to some measure of consideration for their long period of faithful service.

Respectfully submitted,

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT STAFF—PARTICULARS AS TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT

	15 years or more (appoint- ed prior to 10-11-19)	13 to 14 years	11 to 12 years	9 to 10 years	6 to 8 years	5 years or less	Totals	
							Male	Femal
Head Office—Male.....	30	6				5	41	
—Female.....	9	1			7	4		21
Vancouver—Male.....	13	13	2		2		30	
—Female.....		1	1	2	1	3		8
Calgary—Male.....	6	10	1	1	7	3	28	
—Female.....	3	1	1		3			8
Edmonton—Male.....	16	9	2		8		35	
—Female.....	1	1	2	3	4	1		12
Saskatoon—Male.....	17	15			10	4	46	
—Female.....	1	3	4	5	1	1		15
Winnipeg—Male.....	11	6	1		3	4	25	
—Female.....	2	1	4	1	1	1		10
Toronto—Male.....	3	11	1	1	4	2	22	
—Female.....		1			4	2		7
Sherbrooke—Male.....	1	1			1	1	4	
—Female.....		1				1		2
St. John—Male.....	2	7	1	2	5	4	21	
—Female.....		1	1		4	2		8
Totals—Male.....	99	78	8	4	40	23	252	
—Female.....	16	11	13	11	25	15		91

AGES OF SOLDIER SETTLEMENT STAFF

Office	Under 30		30's		40's		50's		60's		Totals	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
Head Office.....		8	8	5	18	6	11	2	4		41	21
Vancouver.....		2	2	3	17	3	10		1		30	8
Edmonton.....	1	6	6	4	13	2	11		4		35	12
Calgary.....		3	3	3	17	1	6	1	2		28	8
Saskatoon.....		4	5	5	27	5	9	1	5		46	15
Winnipeg.....		2	4	4	13	3	6	1	2		25	10
Toronto.....		2	3	3	17	2	2				22	7
Sherbrooke.....		1	2		2	1					4	2
Saint John.....		3	7	4	13			1	1		21	8
Totals.....	1	31	40	31	137	23	55	6	19		252	91

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION ACT

AMENDMENTS TO THE ACT AND REGULATIONS PROPOSED BY THE CIVIL SERVICE
FEDERATION OF CANADA

- (1) That the right to elect to come under the Act be opened to those who failed to come under when the opportunity was previously given.
- (2) That employees paid at prevailing rates be permitted to come under the Act.
- (3) That the minimum benefit to each employee to his dependents or his estate in all cases be not less than the amount of contributions without interest.
- (4) That the 4 per cent interest collected on payments of arrears be waived.
- (5) That contributors be allowed to pay for a part of their non-contributory service if they do not choose to exercise the option of paying for it all; also that those now under the Act who did not elect to pay up arrears be permitted to do so.
- (6) That a married daughter of a deceased widowed contributor, where such daughter was taking the mother's place, be given an appropriate allowance.
- (7) That periods of active service overseas in the military forces of His Majesty or the Allies of His Majesty during the Great War shall be deemed service within the meaning of the Act.
- (8) That the Act be amended to include as service prior service with the Royal North West Mounted Police.
- (9) That the Act be amended to provide optional retirement after 35 years' service.
- (10) That "average salary" be computed in all cases upon salary received during the last three years of service.
- (11) That consideration be given to the lesser potential benefits for single persons than for married people, with a view to more nearly equalizing benefits.
- (12) That prior service of all sorts had with Dominion Government departments, bureaus, commissions, etc., be allowed on the usual conditions regardless of its character.
- (13) That superannuation allowances to permanent seasonal employees be placed on a more equitable footing.

It is just about six o'clock, gentlemen, and we will adjourn till next Wednesday at 11 o'clock.

The committee adjourned at 6 p.m., to resume on Wednesday, 23rd May, 1934, at 11 a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 9

WEDNESDAY, MAY 30, 1934

WITNESSES:

Fred Knowles, President, Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.

Dr. A. E. Cameron, President, Professional Institute of the Civil Servants of Canada.

J. A. MacIsaac, President, Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Miss Edna L. Inglis, Vice-President, Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Mr. Esling, M.P.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, May 30, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Bowman, Acting Chairman, presiding.

Members present, Messrs. Chevrier, Bowman, MacInnis and Laurin.

The following witnesses appeared and submitted representations on behalf of the several bodies of Civil Servants represented by them.

Fred Knowles, President, Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.

Dr. A. E. Cameron, President, Professional Institute of the Civil Servants of Canada.

J. A. MacIsaac, President, Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Miss Edna L. Inglis, Vice-President, Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Mr. Esling, M.P. appeared on behalf of certain postmasters.

The committee adjourned till Wednesday, June 6, at 11 a.m.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk of the Committee.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

May 30, 1934.

The Select Special Committee on Civil Service Act met at 11 a.m., Mr. Bowman presiding.

Mr. MACINNIS: In the absence of the Chairman of the Committee I move that Mr. Bowman take the chair.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have much pleasure in agreeing.
Agreed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: As previously arranged, we were to hear this morning the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.

FRED KNOWLES, called.

'By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You have a statement to submit to the committee, Mr. Knowles?—A. I sent a copy of it to the Committee on the 5th of April.

Q. Well, will you go ahead, Mr. Knowles. In the first place, who do you represent?—A. Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.

Q. And that includes?—A. That includes all classes of civil servants.

Q. Numbering?—A. 4,500.

Q. Numbering 4,500?—A. Yes.

Q. All outside of Ottawa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All right, go ahead now, Mr. Knowles with any statement you desire to make.—A. With respect to paragraph No. 1 of the filed statement:—

That the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board be included in the Permanent Civil Service under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. (See appendix "A").

In view of the fact that Mr. Phelan, of the Civil Service Federation, presented a brief exactly similar to the brief now filed by me, I do not wish to go over the ground that was covered by him, and by General Ross. I would really endorse it.

Q. I think that the committee are pretty well seized with the situation there; we have the full facts before us.—A. I would like to emphasize one point particularly and that is from an administrative angle. What I mean by that is this: At the present time the chairman of the Soldier Settlement Board has been made Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization, and he has control over both staffs—the Soldier Settlement Board staff and the Immigration staff. If the Soldier Settlement Board is to be kept as a separate entity outside of the scope of the Civil Service Act while the employees of the Immigration Department are inside the scope of the Civil Service Act it is going to create administrative difficulties.

Q. I think that one of the previous witnesses appearing before the committee—either General Ross or Mr. Phelan—emphasized that point as well.—A. All right. I just want to impress that point on the minds of the committee because it is not good business for an administrator to have one part of his staff in a water-tight section of the service and another part of it not.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. In what way would it create difficulties, Mr. Knowles?—A. For instance, the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board are temporary employees not under the scope of the Civil Service Act; they could not be assigned to a position inside the scope of the Civil Service Act in the Immigration Department, neither could they be promoted to positions inside the Immigration Department itself. On the other hand an employee in the Soldier Settlement Board, not being permanent, could not be transferred. The Deputy could not transfer a good man from the Soldier Settlement Board to the staff of the Immigration Department, nor could he transfer a good man from the Immigration staff to the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board. It works both ways. It seems to me that the administrative difficulties would be unfair to the person asked to administer under such conditions.

Q. Let me see; the point you are trying to make is that if the director of the Soldier Settlement Board and the Deputy Minister of Immigration, one and the same person, had a vacancy in the Immigration staff and he had quite a capable man in the Soldier Settlement Board he could not make the transfer?—A. He could not do it under existing conditions. He could if the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board were made permanent civil servants.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That means that one part of his general staff is inside the service and the other is outside?—A. That is it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I may say that Mr. Esling, M.P., was to make some representations in this connection, and I told him that we would hear him this afternoon if he had time. I do not know whether he is familiar with the full representations that have been made, but in the meantime I will call his attention to them and perhaps it will shorten it up some. Go ahead, Mr. Knowles.

The WITNESS: No. 2:—

That we request that the provisions of the Hours of Labour and Fair Wage Act of 1930, or the Order in Council P.C. 670 of the 27th of March, 1930 on the 44-hour week be made applicable to those classes of Dominion government employees at the present time working in excess of the provisions of these Acts. (Appendix "B" and "C.")

What I am referring to there particularly are persons employed by the Dominion government working in packing plants and orderlies working in hospitals. At the present time veterinary surgeons, lay inspectors and sundry persons of the Department of Agriculture that work in packing plants do not now have the privilege of either of the eight hour day or the 44-hour week legislation. The situation is like this, that their hours of labour are determined by the number of hours that the packing plant remains open.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. That is for veterinary surgeons or inspectors in these plants?—A. That is it.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. How are they paid now?—A. It is not a question of pay, it is the hours they work.

Q. I am asking you how are they being paid now, on what basis?—A. They are paid a stated annual salary, civil servants in the sense of the term.

Q. And what is your contention with respect to them?—A. My contention is that they should have the 44-hour week and 8-hour day as covered by the legislation.

Q. How would you work it out in practice?—A. Well, I will give you an illustration: There are certain provinces that have the 8-hour law. This law is being broken, and if the law is being broken our veterinary inspectors are also breaking it. Take in British Columbia, you have an 8-hour day law there, it is on the statute books, but it is not very well enforced.

Q. Of course, that is not the fault of the Federal government.—A. It is the fault of the Federal government to the extent that they insist the veterinary surgeons shall put in the hours that that plant operates even if that plant is operating against the law.

Q. What would you do; would you have no inspection?—A. I would say that your veterinary inspectors should be confined to the 8-hour day.

Q. You would put on extra veterinary inspectors for the other hours?—A. If necessary, yes.

Q. How would it work out in a particular district? I am not familiar with the facts but this occurs to me at once, that you have a veterinary inspector covering a certain district?—A. Yes.

Q. He must look after that plant during the full time it operates at certain seasons of the year when it is not standing idle?—A. I do not know of any such case as that.

Q. Well, are the plants not closed down at certain times of the year?—A. I have no knowledge of that.

Q. I understand they are.—A. I have no knowledge of that. The complaint is that the men should come under the legislation of the Dominion government in respect to their hours of labour.

Q. Well, I can see difficulties in making a change if you have a veterinary inspector for a certain district. Take, for instance, a district where you only have perhaps one qualified man, are you going to bring in another qualified man to inspect if the plant is working over an 8-hour day?—A. Either that or compensate the man for the longer hours that he works.

Q. Yes, but he is working at a stated annual salary, is he not?—A. There are all kinds of people working on an annual salary who are paid overtime rates.

Q. Quite true, but what does he do in the off season?—A. I have no knowledge of a veterinary surgeon in a packing plant having an off season.

Q. However, I just point out the difficulties that I see at the present time.—A. The difficulty is simply this: In the legislation there is a clause which states that this legislation shall be effective provided that it is in the public interest and practical. And our contention is that the words "in the public interest" are construed in a manner that was never intended when the legislation was put on the statute books. The words "in the public interest" can be construed all kinds of ways. I could argue that it is not in the public interest for any person to work more than eight hours while we have unemployment in the country.

Q. No doubt about that, yet there are lots of cases where it would be in the public interest for people at times to work over eight hours. We even know some members of parliament that are doing that, strange as it may seem.—A. We go on to a class where it is much more clear. Take the men who are working as orderlies in government hospitals under the Department of Pensions and National Health, those people are working from 63 to 70 hours per week in the London hospital, Westminster hospital and Christie hospital, and we see no reason why these hospital orderlies should not be under the 8-hour day legislation.

Q. Do you know how many are involved?—A. No.

Q. Can you tell us the excess number of hours that they have worked?—A. Do you want me to give you a detailed statement in writing on it?

Q. Yes.—A. I can give the committee that, but I cannot give it to you at the moment.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Have you finished, Mr. Knowles, with the veterinary inspectors?—A. Yes.

Mr. MACINNIS: I have a letter here from one in Winnipeg and I think it puts the position very clearly. I would just like to read parts of it to the committee. The man does not want to have his name made public for fear of discrimination, but the chairman of the committee can have it if he likes. He says:—

I am a veterinary inspector carrying out the provisions of the Food and Canned Meats Act in a small packing plant here in Winnipeg. I believe that according to the Civil Service of Canada I am supposed to have an 8-hour day with one and a half hours for lunch. However, at some time or other we veterinary inspectors were handed over to the packing plants and since then the officials of the plants decide what hours we work. In December and January I was working in a plant where I worked 10½ hours every day. I had half an hour off for lunch. During this half hour I had to change my clothes, walk about 300 yards to eat, eat, walk back and change clothes again. I wrote to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission about the matter and he informed me that I was entitled to one and a half hours for lunch. However, my letter was then forwarded to the Veterinary Director General and he replied that I was required to be present at all times that the plant was operating and that they made the hours at which I would work.

For the past seven years I have been working in a plant at which I have often worked 14 hours a day. This plant was at least a half mile from any transportation line and about a mile from any place where a meal could be purchased. I am sure that during the seven years I went without my dinner at least half the time. It seems to me very peculiar that a civil servant should be handed over to a civilian company to be told what hours he must work.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: He does not say anything about whether or not he was a full time employee, I mean that the plant was operating during the full year.

Mr. MACINNIS: Well, if he was not working there I presume he would be somewhere else.

Mr. LAURIN: Was he paid for the ten hours?

Mr. MACINNIS: No. I presume this man is on a yearly salary.

The WITNESS: Well, that covers the case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It covers the case of that individual, yes. But so far as I am personally concerned, I want to have some more information in connection with the matter, a little fuller information to know just how much of the year these employees actually do work and how much of it was overtime. I can imagine, for instance, districts where perhaps a man would only be on for 8 or 9 or 10 months and would be off for two or three months, but I am not sufficiently familiar with the circumstances to say and want to know something more about it.

The WITNESS: I do not know of a veterinary surgeon having two or three months off, I never heard of it. I understand that they work all the year round.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: All right.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Knowles, in appendix B of your memorandum you submit there a copy of 20-21 George V, chapter 20, and section 4 of that Act reads:—

4. The wages and hours of all workmen employed by the government of Canada on such works as are described in section 3. . . .

Section 3 refers to: “ (1) Every contract made hereafter . . . ” As I understand it, what you want is that that should be amended; is that the place where you want the amendment made?—A. I take it that instead of these men I refer to coming under the Hours of Labour Act, I contend that they come under those that I have mentioned, coming under appendix C, number 9.

Q. Yes.

That it is desirable that the principle of the 8-hour day should be applied to any branches of the public service of Canada in which it is not now observed.

That is what you want?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, of course, that is the Order in Council?—A. Surely.

Q. Those are the terms of the Order in Council P.C. 670 of the 27th March, 1930. The Minister recommended that the principle of the 8-hour day should be applied to any branches of the public service of Canada in which it is not now observed. Well then, that is your case.—A. Yes, I want the veterinary inspectors and the employees in packing plants hired by the Dominion government, and hospital orderlies, to be treated according to that section of the Order in Council, and they are not so treated.

Q. Well, you are not limiting it to just the ones that you have mentioned. What you want is that the 8-hour day should be applied, as it is stated here in the Order in Council:

. . . to any branches of the public service of Canada in which it is not now observed.

A. Yes. I have been asked, however, on behalf of these two classes to present their case.

Q. Of course, whenever you express that in the statement then you leave out those that you do not mention.—A. I hardly think that. My requisition says:

That we request that the provisions of the Hours of Labour and Fair Wage Act of 1930, or the Order in Council P.C. 670 of the 27th of March, 1930, on the 44-hour week be made applicable to those classes of Dominion government employees at the present time working in excess of the provisions of these Acts.

That includes all.

The WITNESS: That is it. No. 3 reads:—

Mr. MACINNIS: I take it that Mr. Knowles' position is that he is speaking specifically for a certain group or section, but that generally what he is asking for would apply to all others.

The WITNESS: That is it. No. 3 reads:—

Civil Service Councils

We request that the provisions of P.C. 970 of the 7th of May, 1930, be given effect to. (Appendix “D”.)

I state in regard to this matter of Civil Service Councils that it is something that has been on the board for say ten years and it has quite a history. We, along with other Civil Service organizations, made this request—

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Have you an extra copy of your report, Mr. Knowles?—A. No, I have not, Mr. Chairman.

Q. I have one, but I wanted one for the clerk.—A. I thought I gave the clerk one last week. However, I will see that he gets one. This matter was taken up with the government long ago and sent to the committee on Industrial and International Relations before which evidence was taken for the staff side in regard thereto, and after the usual procedure an Order in Council was passed by the government on the 7th of May, 1930, the provisions of which are appended; and we are at an utter loss to understand why it is that the provisions of this Order in Council have not been carried out, and we want them to be carried out. The Order in Council provides, that a committee shall be formed consisting of a representative of the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Finance, the Department of Interior, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labour, the Department of National Revenue, the Post Office Department, the Public Works Department, the Department of Secretary of State, the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the Civil Service Commission, and that several such organizations which are enumerated there shall also elect a representative, for the purpose of drawing up a constitution applicable. It even got so far at one stage that we were asked to elect our representative, which was done. We want to see that the Order in Council is implemented. Parliament in principle has accepted it. Any questions to ask on it?

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Of course, the Order in Council states that this committee shall be set up?—A. Yes.

Q. It says:—

Having in mind the foregoing, the Minister submits that the time would now appear appropriate for the taking of the initial step suggested by the report above quoted.

That was on the 7th of May, 1930, and you say that the Order in Council containing that stipulation and recommendation, should long ago have been carried out?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What particular matters would this council consider, Mr. Knowles?—A. I would say it would consider matters that have been brought before this committee for one thing.

Mr. MACINNIS: I was just wondering whether this committee was fulfilling the functions that the council was supposed to fill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have not had time to read the Order in Council.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It reads:—

... to consider and advise the government "upon matters of mutual concern to the government and civil servants in their respective capacities as employer and employees, also as to the establishing of any other consultative and advisory machinery that may be required," and so on.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Where are you reading from, Mr. Chevrier?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Those are the terms of the Order in Council, appendix D.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, but what page?

Mr. CHEVRIER: The second paragraph, Mr. Chairman:—

It will be observed that by adopting the said report the House endorsed "the principle of the establishment by the government of a national civil service council, composed of representatives of the government and the organized civil service in equal numbers, to consider and advise the government."

and so forth, and the next paragraph:—

Having in mind the foregoing, the Minister submits that the time would now appear appropriate for the taking of the initial step suggested by the report above quoted.

I take it that Mr. Knowles wants that put into operation now, and I also take it that is his case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. MacInnis' suggestion is a good one, that this committee is set up for part of the purposes that are set out in the Order in Council.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It went on to say, in that paragraph:—

And further, the House agreed that, as the form of constitution for such a council, covering its scope and functions, can best be determined by joint agreement between the parties concerned, a committee should be set up by the government, representing both the government and the civil service organizations, to draft a constitution for such a National Civil Service Council. . . .

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: No. 4 reads:—

That the Civil Service Act be amended to provide that the status of any employee in the civil service, appointed prior to the 10th day of November, 1919, whose employment therein has since been continuous, shall, subject to the approval of the department and the commission, be deemed to be, and shall be such as to entitle him or her to all the benefits enjoyed by employees classified as permanent.

That is the long-term temporary problem. I might state in this connection, that I have not noticed any evidence previously submitted in connection with what happens to some of those long-term employees if their dependents happen to die. In years gone by we had a bonus scheme. To give you an illustration: Supposing the salary of the class was \$900 minimum to \$1,140 maximum, when the bonus regulations were in being the persons who were temporaries and at the minimum of the class received the war bonus. Then when the war bonus was absorbed into the salary the sum of \$300 war bonus was added on to the salary and those persons have been getting \$1,200. If the man was made permanent automatically the bonus decreased as his statutory increases were granted and subsequently became his normal salary rate. But those people that are permanent temporaries, never getting any statutory increases, have still to fill out the "Head of Household" form to get this bonus, creating a position that if the wife of the individual dies that \$300 is taken off his salary; and in one instance that I know of, after thirty years of service, a man has had \$300 taken off his salary because his wife died, and it is obviously most unfair. If these men had been made permanent at the time they should have been made permanent what would have happened in practice would have been this: He would get his statutory increase from \$900 to \$1,020, then the bonus would decrease gradually, and so on, he would get another statutory increase and the bonus would reduce, but with those long-term temporaries being continually on the minimum salary it is not so reduced, but when his dependents die he finds himself with \$900 whereas he has been getting \$1,200 during the last eighteen years of service, and that is a condition that should not be allowed to exist.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. How many of those cases, Mr. Knowles, have you got and where?—A. Oh, there are a lot of them. You can get the figure from Mr. Minard of the Department of Public Works.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Is there a bonus system in existence at the present time?—A. Yes, for the long-term temporaries who were in the service while the war bonus was in operation, and they have to fill out every year a "Head of Household" form. If they lose the dependents that bonus comes off.

Q. Explain it a little more clearly will you, for my benefit?—A. I think it is very clear. Take a cleaner and helper, his salary rate is \$900 to \$1.140.

Q. You are talking now about those who were in the service prior to 1919?—A. Yes, that is what I am talking about. The salary rate fixed is \$900 to \$1.140. Now, if you are a temporary you are at the minimum of \$900; this salary rate does not include bonus; that is the salary rate as fixed by the Civil Service Commission.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Excuse me, Mr. Knowles, if you are temporary you never receive statutory increases that will take you up to the maximum?—A. That is true. Now, those men were getting a salary of \$900 and a bonus of \$300 at the time the bonus was incorporated into the salary.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Yes, that is the bonuses granted in lieu of what the man in the service is getting as a statutory increase?—A. Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh no. The war bonus was given because of the increased cost of living.

The WITNESS: Yes, but with the temporary employees they had to continue to fill out the "Head of Household" form.

Q. Yes, but at the time it was granted it was granted as a war bonus. Why was the bonus continued?—A. Well, the war bonus was reduced from \$420 by legislation; from one year to another it kept coming down and then eventually they absorbed the bonus into salary.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. Knowles, when you say "war bonus" I think you are creating an impression that is not quite proper. That was given during what we call the time of the war.—A. Well, it was a cost-of-living bonus.

Q. Yes, because the salaries at that time were inadequate and then the government fixed the bonus and we called it a war bonus; but it did not end with the war, it kept on as an increase in salary because of the deficiency in salary that these people were getting at the time. War bonus is a misnomer.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The bonus is, of course, an increase, which takes the place of an increased salary.

Mr. MACINNIS: No it is not, because it is only granted yearly because of the household expenses of the civil servant.

Mr. CHEVRIER: On account of the increased cost of living.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: But still it is in lieu of an increase in salary to the fellow that is outside the service to put him on more or less the same basis as the man inside the service.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That was in an endeavour to equalize the salaries of those who were not entitled to increases in salary; those who were outside got a bonus, and even those who were in the service got some bonus yet their statutory increases kept on. As Mr. Knowles is explaining, if you got your statutory increase then the bonus was decreased gradually, but those are the fellows who had no statutory increases at any time and they received a bonus in order to make up for their lower rate of salary.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, I understand that. Now, the point that you are making is—A. The point I am making is that to-day if the dependents die the bonus disappears and they go to the minimum salary of the class, which, in this case, is \$900.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is quite clear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: So after all it is a decrease in salary which goes to the poor fellow who happens to have a dependent that dies; in such a case he has got to suffer a decrease in salary.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. The bonus is a misnomer?—A. Yes. Supposing you were one of the permanent temporaries and you were on the job the 1st of February, 1920, before another man comes in the service, the day that he, through the Civil Service Commission, when the position is advertised, gets the job he has nothing to do with bonus at all; he gets the \$900 minimum. Then the year after he gets up to the maximum, or by statutory increases he gets up to the maximum, but the other chap that was there before him because he is called a temporary employee, when his dependent dies his bonus is cut off.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. This man coming into the service after October 1st, is he a temporary too?—A. No no, he is made a permanent. Something should be done in respect to this temporary proposition because I think it is absurd for anyone to say that a man can be a permanent temporary employee. It is a contradiction in terms. I never could understand why we call them permanent temporaries. You cannot be temporary if you are permanent and you cannot be permanent if you are temporary.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. But the fact of the matter is that you are.—A. Of course, what we contend is that a man should have his permanent position in the service if he is filling that position. If a person is filling that permanent position satisfactorily he should have the same rights and privileges as any person occupying a permanent position; he should only be a temporary man when it is a temporary position.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. No question injustices have resulted. There is one point you might clear up for me there in connection with the bonus system: Presuming that a man in the temporary service prior to 1919 had no dependents he did not get any bonus or increased living allowance?—A. They had a smaller bonus for the single people.

Q. But he did get a bonus?—A. Yes.

Q. Well then, what position was he in later on, not having any dependents his salary would still continue at the old basis plus bonus?—A. Oh well, in those cases what happened when the salaries were revised was that his maximum salary was put to the prior salary plus bonus.

Q. Well then, do I understand this anomaly in the situation to-day, that here you have two men along side each other, temporary employees along side one another, one a man with a wife and family getting an increased living allowance called a bonus?—A. He did, but does not now.

Q. Well, I understood that he does get it yet from what you said.—A. No no, he does not.

Q. Providing his dependents are still living does he not get a bonus to-day?—A. No.

Q. Under the system?—A. No.

Q. What does he get?—A. The only people that have signed the Head of Household bonus form are these long term temporary employees.

Q. That is what I am talking about; I am talking about long term temporaries, the man who has a wife and family to-day still gets his salary plus a bonus?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, that is the point; you must have misunderstood me. Take a single man who had no dependents whatsoever; he started back in 1919 on exactly the same basis or perhaps a little less because of the fact that it did not cost him so much to live. These two men arrived at the same time; in May, 1934, this one man with the wife and family, as you say, lost his wife and immediately he lost his extra living allowance and is reduced back to the old schedule of \$900?—A. That is it.

Q. But the single man continued along at the \$900 plus \$150 or \$200, or whatever it may be?—A. That is true.

Q. Well, it seems to me a very strange situation.—A. Oh yes, it is strange all right.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have that right, Mr. Putnam?

Mr. PUTNAM: Yes, and no, because that single bonus was abolished prior to the time that they had a Head of Household bonus; the bonus to single people was abolished either one or two years before the Head of Household bonus was absorbed into salary, so that it may be that that single employee went back to the \$900 minimum at the time the single bonus was abolished.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What do you say Mr. Knowles? There seems to be quite a difference there. I want to get the matter cleared up in my own mind.—A. I would not contradict the statement of Mr. Putnam on that. I do not know of any single man in that position at all.

Mr. PUTNAM: I would think, Mr. Chairman, that there were no such cases of a single man getting more than the minimum of the class. It is only married men, or heads of households and when the dependents die they go to the minimum of the class.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That clears it up somewhat. From what I understood from Mr. Knowles in the first place, certainly there would be a very great distinction between the treatment handed out to a married man and that handed out to a single man. All right, Mr. Knowles.

The WITNESS: I have nothing further to say in respect to that clause. No. 5:—

We request that P.C. 1053 of June 29, 1922, which removed from the scope of the Civil Service Act some 13,000 employees previously thereunder, be cancelled and that the positions affected be returned to within the scope of the Civil Service Act. (Appendix "E").

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. In what departments were these civil servants?—A. In the main they are prevailing rate employees, and they are all outlined in my memorandum, others as well. The Income Tax Branch is debarred from the Civil Service Act, the Taxation Branch, and the Preventative Service, and so on, and we take the position that a lot of the troubles and anomalies in the civil service are created by the fact that you have people coming into the service through the medium of the Civil Service Commission and you have other people coming into the service in an entirely different manner. For instance, in one department of government—Customs—you have the Income Tax Branch outside the scope of the Civil Ser-

vice Act, and you have the ordinary clerical staffs in Customs inside the scope of the Civil Service Act. You have the appraisers outside the scope of the Civil Service Act, and we do not think that it tends to proper administration of the service when you have conditions of that nature where one man can be promoted to a position because he is under the Civil Service Act and another man cannot be promoted because he came into the service in an entirely different manner. We think that these continual acts of government in taking away positions under the Civil Service Act is a backward step. Since the passing of the Civil Service Act in 1918 I do not think there has been a session of parliament during which some classes have not been taken away from the Civil Service Act, or positions created exempting them from its scope, and the general tendency has been to weaken the merit system ever since its inception, and I make the statement on this ground, there has not been a session of parliament when they have not created positions outside the scope of the Civil Service Act or taken away positions that were already under the scope of it.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. That is, since the passing of the Civil Service Act?—A. Yes, since the passing of the Civil Service Act, every session of parliament without exception; they either take people away from it or create positions exempt from it. Even at the present time I think there is some suggestion to take away from the Civil Service Act the employees of the Radio Commission. Certain classes were exempt for a period of one year, and the clerical staffs were within the scope of the Civil Service Act, but I understand now that attempts are being made to take the whole of the staff of the Radio Commission away from the Civil Service Act. And every time you take anything away from that Act you weaken the merit system; whether you do it intentionally or otherwise it weakens it. What we should do is to strengthen it, but we cannot strengthen it by taking away from the Civil Service Act. If there are any faults in connection with the merit system they should be corrected inside the scope of the Act. That is our considered view after having the experience both inside and outside the scope of the Civil Service Act covering a period of 25 years. And we say that all classes should be brought under, progressively perhaps, not all at once; but they should be brought in progressively in the best interests of the country.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Mr. Phelan, you were to give us a memorandum on prevailing rates employees and how they were scattered throughout the service.

Mr. PHELAN: I have been preparing the figures, Mr. Chairman, and I hope to have them for you within a day or two.

The WITNESS: That is all I have got to say on that.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Any questions to ask Mr. Knowles on this point? All right, Mr. Knowles.

The WITNESS: We are again asking for the repeal of the Private Secretaries Bill.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. In regard to No. 6, Mr. Knowles, who do you speak for in respect to that:

We request that the Income Tax Branch of the Department of National Revenue be brought within the scope of the Civil Service Act, and, progressively, all other branches of the service now exempt.

Do you speak on behalf of employees of that department, or what portion of them, or what number?—A. Well, this is the result of a resolution passed at our 1931 convention and again at our 1933 convention, and was introduced and concurred in by delegates from the National Revenue Department.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Although you are asking that certain people be included or be brought under the Civil Service Act it does not mean that you are speaking directly for any of these because they belong to your organization; you are dealing with a matter of principle?—A. Yes. We have Income Tax employees in our organization connected with the National Revenue Department in the cities where we are organized; this resolution was sent to them prior to going before the convention, and the convention endorsed the resolution that we request the Income Tax Branch be brought under the Civil Service Act.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What proportion of the employees in the National Revenue Department does your organization represent?—A. I cannot tell you that.

Q. No idea?—A. I cannot tell you that.

Q. Well, the reason I ask that question is whether or not the representations you make represent a substantial number of the employees of the department?—A. The representations I make are on behalf of 4,500 civil servants irrespective of department. We tackle this as a general principle. The principle of the merit system under the Civil Service Act.

Q. Yes, but I think it would be of some use to the committee to know that in the representations which you make on behalf of employees of a specific department, just what portion of the employees belong to your organization so that we will know whether that representation comes from the employees themselves or their representatives?—A. Oh, it comes from the representatives all right, there is no doubt at all about that.

Q. Yes, what portion does that represent? In any event, you say you do not know just what proportion?—A. I do not know the number, certainly not. However, I will give you the figures in respect to that.

Q. All right, Mr. Knowles, No. 7.—A. No. 7:—

That we request the repeal of an Act to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries) known as Chapter 38, 19-20 George V, June 14th, 1929. (Appendix "F.")

Q. Yes, that is the old question that we had up in 1932.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I think we understand the situation pretty thoroughly.—A. Well, we contend that that Act was passed on the principle that the Civil Service is an institution for providing jobs.

Q. Something more than that I hope.—A. Well, it is based on that principle, it is not based on any other principle, at least that section of it that states that a secretary of a Cabinet Minister shall receive a certain position. We are opposed to that section of the Act. Section 2 of the Act says:—

(2) If such person holds a permanent position in the Civil Service he may be paid an additional salary not exceeding six hundred dollars a year whilst so acting; but if he does not hold a permanent position in the Civil Service, he may be paid such salary as the Governor in Council may prescribe, and in the event of the Minister or other member of the government, or the leader of the opposition for whom he is acting as secretary, ceases to be a Minister or member of the government or to be the leader of the opposition, as the case may be, the said secretary shall thereupon be appointed to a permanent position in the public service classified not lower than that of chief clerk.

It does not even specify as to whether or not there should be a vacancy; this legislation means that he shall be found a position at a specific salary whether there is a vacancy in the service or not, or without considering in any shape or form persons who have been in the service for a number of years and who have

been striving to promote themselves in the service. And that part of the Act we are very much opposed to. We do not concede that the Civil Service of this country is a place in which to provide jobs. We think that it is an institution for the purpose of giving service.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Any questions on that point, gentlemen?

Mr. CHEVRIER: We have all that evidence.

The WITNESS: It was covered last year, I admit that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No. 8, Mr. Knowles?

The WITNESS: No. 8:—

Whereas, in circular P.S.B. 120 under date of May 9th, 1927, the classification was laid down for Office Boy, and whereas, at the present, Special Delivery Messengers come under the employment of City Postmasters and not under the Department or Civil Service Commission, we request that Special Delivery Messengers be classified as Office Boys under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and further, that they be eligible for promotion in the service on qualifying under the Civil Service examinations as laid down from time to time by the Civil Service Commission.

I will have to explain No. 8 a little. At the present time special delivery messengers in the Post Office Department are not hired by the government in one sense, neither are they paid a salary. They are hired by the local postmasters and they are paid at the rate of 8 cents per each special delivery letter which they deliver if they live in a small city, and they are paid 10 cents per letter if they are resident in a large city. The reason for the difference is that in large cities they have larger distances to travel to deliver the letters than if they were resident in a small city. That is all these boys do. If, which often occurs, there is a period of time between the delivery of special delivery letters these boys have nothing to do but hang around public buildings. We think that it would be much better instead of hiring these boys in this manner if they were given a classification as office boys in the large post offices particularly, at a stated annual salary, and in the period of time when there were no special delivery letters to deliver they would be employed learning something useful, such as sorting mail and regular mail duties, and in the process of time providing they pass the examinations they could be promoted to positions such as letter carrier, postal porter, or postal clerk, as the case may be. We think that that would give these boys something to look forward to instead of as at the present time having nothing to look forward to.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I think that is a very good recommendation. Has it been submitted to the Department?—A. Yes, I have submitted it to the Department.

Q. When?—A. Oh, I have submitted it to them many times and I told them I was going to bring it up here.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Did that have any affect at all?—A. Well now, that is a pretty hard question to answer. It is well received in certain places and not so well received in other places.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What would the average age of these messengers be?—A. Well, I would say at the present time 18 to 20. The youngest would be 16, up to 20 years of age. There are only about 60 employed in Canada. In large cities

such as Montreal and Toronto they have quite a few, and two or three in Vancouver, but I think the correct figure is 60 throughout the country.

Q. About 60?—A. Yes.

Q. And running from 16 to 20 years of age?—A. Perhaps there are some of them older, but they are not hired by the government; they are hired by the local postmaster and they are paid in that manner.

Q. How many of them ever do work into the service?—A. Very few, but if they want to they are debarred, in this sense: If they take an examination to qualify then of course they are debarred by the returned soldier preference.

Q. Of course, you would not figure doing away with the examination?—A. Oh no, but I have watched around post offices and I have seen what they do, and I thought that we ought to attempt to do something in order to assist a boy to work up rather than be nothing except a messenger boy.

Q. Of course, I suppose it is a stop gap, that is about what it amounts to.—A. Yes, he cannot be anything else, and we thought that it would be better if they would hire these boys on an annual salary. The salary for an office boy is around \$420. I think they earn more than that, but if they were taken in then when there are no special delivery letters to deliver they could be taught to sort mail and when the time comes give them an examination and a chance to promote themselves in the service.

Q. Well, there is nothing to prevent these boys from making application for the position and writing the examination, is there?—A. That is true. They can write the examinations and make application for the positions all right, but they are debarred by the returned soldier preference from getting the positions.

Mr. MACINNIS: My understanding of what Mr. Knowles is asking for is that there be a classification made for office boys and that it be specified what they would be allowed to do, and then when a vacancy occurs they would possibly be in a better position to write on the examination.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: But there is already a classification for office boys.

Mr. MACINNIS: Yes, but these boys are not brought under it.

The WITNESS: It is before they are ready to write the examination. They would have to write the examination to qualify for the position of office boy in the first place, but what I am concerned about is what they are doing between the delivery of letters. I say they should be kept doing something, and the Post Office cannot give them anything to do now except delivering letters. If there are no letters to deliver these boys have nothing to do except idle their time away until such time as they get another letter. We want to tackle it from that point of view. Let the boy deliver letters and in between times allow him to learn something.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Have you anything showing the average salary that is being earned by these boys at the present time?—A. I will file that with you.

Q. All right, Mr. Knowles. Anything else?—A. Yes sir. There are one or two things I noticed in the evidence, sir. On Page 276 there is a schedule of thirteen requests in respect to superannuation presented by Mr. Phelan. These thirteen clauses, in the main, are endorsed by every civil service organization in Canada. There is not the slightest doubt at all about that, and these thirteen clauses have been placed before the Advisory Committee on the Superannuation Act and certain decisions have been reached in certain cases, and in some cases no decision at all. What we would like to see done in respect of these cases is that the recommendation of the Civil Service Advisory Board be given legislative effect.

Q. That is what Mr. Phelan asked for?—A. I noticed while speaking on superannuation, that Mr. Bowman was somewhat concerned in respect to the cost of bringing prevailing rate employees under superannuation, and I would like to see this question tackled from an entirely different angle. I would like to see it tackled from the viewpoint of what it costs you if you do not put them under superannuation.

Q. It really should be looked at from all angles, should it not, but you will admit this, Mr. Knowles, that at the present time and under existing conditions dollars and cents have something to do with these things?—A. Oh, yes. However, I am prepared to give you some figures in respect to dollars and cents if you don't. Previous to 1920 there was no Superannuation Act in this country. Most of the staffs of the government were under the old retirement fund which was, in effect, a compulsory savings bank arrangement. Immediately after the war the government decided to get rid of what it thought was dead wood in the service, and I assume also wanted to create positions for persons returning from overseas to replace the dead wood in the service, and they passed an Act known as the Calder Act. Now, this Act did not take any contributions from the staff side whatsoever. It also covered prevailing rate employees to a degree.

Q. Pardon me for interrupting. When you are talking about prevailing rate employees the Calder Act also specified them did it not?—A. Yes, but that is beside the point.

Q. Of course, that is another matter that I have in mind; we have had certain representations made by some of the men in the Public Works Department whom I had in mind when I asked the question?—A. A lot of the people who went out under the Calder Act, not only did they get the benefits of the Calder Act but on top of that they got the contributions that they had paid into the retirement fund as well. That Act cost Canada up to last year \$6,956,530 and an annual obligation at this date of \$511,247 without any contribution from the staff side in any shape or form.

Q. Do you think that is wrong?—A. Do I think it is wrong?

Q. Yes?—A. No, but I think it is poor administration.

Q. All right?—A. Then we come along and you pass in 1924 the Superannuation Act. You take in under that Act all persons on a stated annual salary up to over \$600 per annum and you leave out prevailing rate classes, and then you come to a stage, such as 1933, where you find you want to get rid of a lot more dead wood in the service

Q. Get rid of what?—A. Get rid of a lot more dead wood in the service who are not covered by the Superannuation Act, so you have to act on the ground of expediency if you want to be human at all, and you give to those people six months pay gratis and then under the retirement act you give them a gratuity too on top of the payment for the retirement fund Act. In practice persons that are not under the Superannuation Act at all are retained in the service many times when their services could be economically dispensed with; they are kept on on humanitarian grounds simply because the average Deputy Minister is a human being; he does not like to put a man out on the street with 20 or 30 years of service behind him, so what does he do? He pays him 100 per cent salary as long as he possibly can do it, whereas if you had these people under a broad scheme of superannuation into which they contributed, in the long run it would be economical administration of government affairs and everybody would be treated justly.

Q. Would you advocate a change in the present superannuation system?—A. I would advocate that it be extended to all classes in the service whose positions are of a permanent indeterminate duration whether they are paid monthly, hourly, or daily rates of pay.

Q. I understand that; that is along the line of representations previously made by Mr. Phelan, but just going back to that superannuation, the superannuation scheme or fund as administered at the present time is satisfactory?

A. No, not altogether. In principle it is all right, but there are one or two phases of it that we do not agree with.

Q. You mentioned the fact that certain people are kept on in the service upon the recommendation of the Deputy Minister?—A. I did not put it exactly that way. I say that there are persons in the service who are not covered by a superannuation scheme who would be let out of the service were they under a superannuation scheme; but they are kept on on humanitarian grounds. I take that as common knowledge.

Q. And, as a matter of fact, there are many in the service that do get the benefit of the superannuation who are kept on for five or six months on the same grounds.

Mr. MACINNIS: Of course, I think that is a different question and should be dealt with under a different heading.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No, it is not a different question. What Mr. Knowles is trying to point out is that in dollars and cents there would be a saving made by bringing some of these long term temporaries and prevailing rate employees under the superannuation fund, that you would do away with keeping them on in the service for five or six months on compassionate grounds.

The WITNESS: That is it.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Sometimes a few years.

The WITNESS: Oh yes, and sometimes there are other grounds besides compassionate grounds. There is another point I want to bring up. Take the unfairness of granting six months pay, even on humanitarian grounds. For instance, if there were two people working in a department both aged 65, and it was determined that they could dispense with one position, that is, they could let both of them out and hire a young man, the young man taking the position of the two. If it was your position that was to be filled you do not get the six months pay, but if your position was not to be filled you do get it. Can you imagine anything that would create dissatisfaction more than that, where John Brown, age 65, whose position is to be filled does not get the six months pay and Bill Jones, age 65, who is also let out but whose position is not to be filled is given six months pay? I have nothing more to say on superannuation at the moment.

I have one or two other things that I want to bring up. I want to bring up the question of statutory holidays, and I want to refer particularly to the lightkeepers. This question was mentioned by Mr. Neill the other day. I would like to say that I have a case that was brought to my attention in respect of a lighthouse keeper at Porlier Pass, Vancouver Island. He gets his mail once a week; he is 12 miles from the nearest town, and it costs him \$5 to get there; it is a one man station; he has no family resident with him, and he is on the job 365 days in the year, but he is not allowed his annual leave. The Department says that his is not an isolated station. I have here a letter from the Agent of Marine, Victoria:—

With reference to your request of the 17th Ultimo for leave of absence from July 10th to July 21st, both dates inclusive. This will have to be referred to the Department at Ottawa, but before doing so will you kindly advise if you are prepared to take this leave under the usual conditions, namely, that you provide the services of a proper substitute and that the responsibility of the station is yours during your absence.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the leave regulations of the Civil Service Commission never contemplated that a man had to be isolated to get annual

leave. I can well understand—and I go so far as to say that I agree—that in a three man station or a two man station that can operate with two men during the period while a third takes his holidays without any cost to the Department that that should be done, but in a case like this where a man is 365 days in the year alone there should be absolutely no question of him getting his annual leave if he applies for it. I would like the committee to make some recommendation in that regard. While it might be true that it is purely a departmental matter, why sometimes you want something to move the department.

While talking on annual leave I have something else that I would like to bring up. Recently the Public Works Department have notified certain employees—and the Marine Department have done likewise—that due to the fact that their position is not under the scope of the Civil Service Act they will not get the leave that they previously have been getting. The basis of the Department's decision is the fact that in May, 1928, the Justice Department made a ruling to the effect that a person whose position was outside the scope of the Civil Service Act was not entitled to the privileges of the Act or its regulations. That is all right as far as it goes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Well, if you followed that ruling to its logical conclusion none of these thousands of employees in the service that have come under these two main classifications would be entitled to leave; is that as I understand the effect of the decision?—A. Exactly. Now, in practice, ever since the Civil Service Act was passed all departments of government have granted the same sick leave and annual leave regulations to their employees whether they are under the Act or otherwise.

Q. When was this ruling made?—A. On the 28th May, 1928, by the Justice Department.

Q. And it has been enforced in what departments?—A. It has been enforced by the Marine Department, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, with regard to certain classes, and in Public Works.

Q. Can you give us a memorandum of the number of employees affected in these departments?—A. I can get that for you.

Q. And also submit to us information as to when the former practice was departed from and leave not now granted. You say formerly leave was granted, that they were treated exactly the same as if they were under the Act?—A. Yes, up until recently.

Q. I want to know when that practice ceased.—A. Yes. I think it ceased this year in the main.

Q. And give the numbers too, all particulars.—A. Yes.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Has it ceased in the case of all employees outside the Civil Service Act?—A. Oh no, it is only being applied to certain classes in the civil service.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Why?—A. That is what I would like to know.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Putnam, would you be good enough to make some inquiries in connection with this matter?

Mr. PUTNAM: I will, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: You want me to ascertain when this has been enforced and how many have been affected to date? I have had complaints during the last two weeks from pretty nearly every city from Montreal west to Vancouver. It was not in effect last year.

I think that is all, Mr. Chairman, unless you wish to ask me some questions. I will get the information you asked me for.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Mr. Knowles. You have covered a pretty wide field and presented some real problems for us.

AMALGAMATED CIVIL SERVANTS OF CANADA

OFFICE OF NATIONAL SECRETARY, April 5, 1934.

Mr. J. EARL LAWSON, M.P.,

Chairman, Select Committee on

Civil Service and Civil Service Act.

DEAR SIR,—On behalf of the above Organization, representing about 4,500 Civil Servants of all classes employed outside Ottawa, I respectfully request that consideration be given to the following proposals endorsed at our Convention held in September last, and which we believe, if enacted, will tend to improve the Service and its administration.

(1) That the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board be included in the Permanent Civil Service under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. (See Appendix "A").

(2) That we request that the provisions of the Hours of Labour and Fair Wage Act of 1930, or the Order in Council P.C. 670 of the 27th of March, 1930, on the 44-hour week be made applicable to those classes of Dominion Government employees at the present time working in excess of the provisions of these Acts. (Appendix "B" and "C").

(3) *Civil Service Councils*.—We request that the provisions of P.C. 970 of the 7th of May, 1930, be given effect to. (Appendix "D").

(4) That the Civil Service Act be amended to provide that the status of any employee in the Civil Service, appointed prior to the 10th day of November, 1919, whose employment therein has since been continuous, shall, subject to the approval of the Department and the Commission, be deemed to be, and shall be such as to entitle him or her to all the benefits enjoyed by employees classified as permanent.

(5) We request that P.C. 1053 of June 29, 1922, which removed from the scope of the Civil Service Act some 13,000 employees previously thereunder, be cancelled and that the positions affected be returned to within the scope of the Civil Service Act. (Appendix "E").

(6) We request that the Income Tax Branch of the Department of National Revenue be brought within the scope of the Civil Service Act, and, progressively all other branches of the service now exempt.

(7) That we request the repeal of an Act to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries) known as Chapter 38, 19-20, George V, June 14, 1929. (Appendix "F").

(8) Whereas, in Circular P.S.B. 120 under date of May 9, 1927, the classification was laid down for Office Boy, and whereas, at the present, Special Delivery Messengers come under the employment of City Postmasters and not under the Department or Civil Service Commission, we request that Special Delivery Messengers be classified as Office Boys under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and further, that they be eligible for promotion in the Service on qualifying under the Civil Service examinations as laid down from time to time by the Civil Service Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

FRED KNOWLES,

National Secretary.

APPENDIX "A"

RE: SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS AND PERMANENCY OF THE
STAFF OF THE SOLDIER SETTLEMENT OF CANADA

We submit the following reasons why the Staff of the Soldier Settlement of Canada should be included in the permanent Civil Service and extended the benefits of the Superannuation Act.

1. Members of the staff have performed up to 15 years continuous, useful, public service, not including war service.

2. The work of the Department must continue for at least another 20 years on the basis of specific land settlement contracts between the Department and settlers under its jurisdiction.

3. The Department was reorganized in 1931 and has been reported to Parliament as now being on an efficient business basis with reasonable administration cost. (Reference Hansard, pages 5049 and 5100, May 8th and 9th, 1933.)

The following information is furnished with respect to the organization and nature of the work performed.

STAFF

This petition concerns a staff of 343 temporary employees, 251 of whom are males and 92 females. Ninety-eight per cent of the male staff are returned soldiers.

Sixty-two members of the staff are located at Head Office, Ottawa, two hundred and eighty-one are attached to District Offices throughout the Dominion; of this number ninety-nine are fieldmen located throughout the Dominion at strategic points in the territory for which they are responsible. Seventeen members of Head Office Accounts staff were made permanent last year as part of the Treasury staff.

The following table shows staff distribution:—

	Male	Female	Total
Head office..	41	21	62
Vancouver..	30	8	38
Calgary	28	8	36
Edmonton	34	13	47
Saskatoon	46	15	61
Winnipeg	25	10	35
Toronto	22	7	29
Sherbrooke	4	2	6
Saint John	21	8	29
	251	92	343

Reorganization of the Soldier Settlement Department in 1931 resulted in retirement of 158 of the then personnel; salary cost reduction \$270,264 and the closing of three District Offices. The Organization may now fairly be said to be on a permanent basis.

ADMINISTRATION COST

The Honourable W. A. Gordon, Minister of the Department, in dealing with administration cost of Soldier Settlement before Parliament last year, stated as follows:—

To-day the cost of administration is less than one per cent (of the net investment), which compares very favourably with the cost of administration of loan companies handling similar business. (Reference Hansard, May 9th, 1933, page 5100.)

SCOPE OF WORK

The Soldier Settlement Department conducts the work of Soldier Land Settlement under the Soldier Settlement Act of 1919 and amendments, and

General Land Settlement as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization. The two activities are complementary.

The value of these two phases of work being performed by one Organization was brought out in Report of the Board of Audit, October 1st, 1929, page 21, under "Recommendations":—

(a) Resulting from our survey of the activities of the board, we have come to the conclusion that the interests of the Dominion and the ultimate realization upon its investment of over \$55,000,000 in loans and properties, will necessitate for some years, the exercise of sound judgment and careful attention to collections. The Dominion has in the Settlement organization a staff with a practical working knowledge of conditions throughout the country. As work in connection with the Soldier Settlement loans decreases every effort should be made to use this organization in the general colonization work of the Dominion.

EXTENT OF WORK

(a) *Soldier and British Family Settlement*

At this date there are 22,095 farm properties under the administration of the Department representing a net public investment of \$57,100,376.31 inclusive of British Family Settlement loans.

There are:—

11,205 soldier settlers whose contracts continue until the year 1947.

5,650 "civilian settlers" (i.e., purchasers of reverted soldier settlement farms) whose contracts continue up to 1959.

2,182 British family settlers whose contracts extend to 1955.

There is a total of 19,037 active loans and 3,058 farms on hand for resettlement or resale.

The current accounts of settlers are covered by individual land contracts which run for a period of 25 years during which time as settlers repay their loans or as they transfer, or assign their interest, deeds, conveyances and assignments have to be drawn approved and executed; foreclosed properties have to be resold; insurance to the extent of \$19,000,000 on farm buildings has to be carried and renewed, and security covering the entire indebtedness has to be preserved.

Work similar to that of a mortgage or lending institution has to be undertaken in connection with the administration of this public estate. The work is divided into three Departments:—

Accounting

Estates and Securities

Field Supervision

In addition to necessary supervision furnished backward settlers, the field staff is required by specific agreements with the British Government to render field supervision service to British family settlers under the Three Thousand British Family Agreement and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Scheme.

(b) *General Land Settlement*

The evolution of the Soldier Settlement staff from a purely Soldier Settlement Organization to its present position wherein it administers Soldier Settlement and General Land Settlement as the colonization arm of the Department of Immigration and Colonization has been gradual. Each successive step in the field of general colonization has been necessitated by actual settlement demands for practical services of a character the Department is equipped to give.

Under Orders in Council P. C. 1645, August 17, 1923, P. C. 320, March 14, 1927, and P.C. 698, April 14, 1927, the administration of the Soldier Settlement Act was transferred from the Minister of the Interior and placed under the Minister of Immigration and Colonization and provision made that Soldier Settlement Staff or such portion of staff as the Minister may from time to time determine shall be designated as the Land Settlement Branch of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

Prior to 1923 the Department of Immigration and Colonization had no Land Settlement service and, therefore, existed in name only in so far as actual settlement activities were concerned.

As an indication of the work coming under the heading "General Land Settlement," the Land Settlement Branch has placed in farm employment 66,494 persons from January 1, 1924, to December 31, 1933.

Special reference is made to the work of the staff in connection with the Back-to-the-Land Movement instituted by the Government in the Autumn of 1930. This work has taken the form of a co-ordinated effort between the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the Colonization Departments of the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railways. In the period October 1, 1930, to December 31, 1933, a total of 94,092 persons have been absorbed into agricultural life by the three agencies mentioned and of this number the Land Settlement Branch was directly responsible for the settlement and placement of 21,427 persons.

In May 1932, the Federal Government entered into agreement with eight Provincial Governments for settlement on land of qualified unemployed families—the Relief Settlement Plan—under which 2,701 families, including 14,358 persons, have already been settled. On the recommendation of Provincial Governments the Agreements are being extended for a further two years. The Soldier Settlement staff has taken an active part in this work in all Provinces. Clause 6 of the Dominion Provincial Agreements reads as follows:

"The Province shall set up an Advisory Committee upon which shall be included representatives of the Dominion Land Settlement Branch, the Colonization Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the Colonization Branch of the Canadian National Railways."

(c) Services to other Departments

In recent years this organization has carried out rural investigations for the following Dominion Government departments:—

- (1) Department of Pensions and National Health (Relief to war pensioners).
- (2) The War Veterans Allowance Committee (Allowances to disabled veterans not eligible for pension).
- (3) The Board of Pension Commissioners (Special reports as required).
- (4) Department of Interior (Patents to soldier settler holders of Dominion Land).

The number of investigations conducted for other Departments in 1932 totalled 7,110 and in 1933 the total was 6,511.

In conclusion it is submitted:—

(a) That substantial work in Soldier Settlement must continue during the period of Soldier Settlement Agreements and Civilian Settlers' Land Agreements until the years 1947-1959.

(b) That substantial general land settlement and colonization commitments have been entered into with the British Government under the Three Thousand British Family and 500 New Brunswick Family Settlement Agreements which, as above indicated, require the services of a staff until 1955. The services of the Land Settlement Branch are required to perform the work of general colonization and settlement described.

(c) That our usefulness as a service department has been established in connection with the rural investigations aforementioned, and that because of the saving which has obviously been made to the public treasury, such activities will doubtless be continued for many years to come.

In addition to the above considerations that staff of the Soldier Settlement of Canada urge that it be borne in mind that most of the staff have already been employed up to fifteen years and feel that they are justly entitled to some measure of consideration for their long period of faithful service.

APPENDIX "B"

20-21 GEORGE V

CHAP. 20

An Act respecting Fair Wages and an Eight Hour Day for Labour employed on Public Works of the Dominion of Canada.

(Assented to May 30, 1930)

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Short title.

1. This Act may be cited as The Fair Wages and Eight Hour Day Act, 1930.

"Minister."

2. In this Act the expression "Minister" means the Minister of Labour.

Government contracts subject to certain conditions.

3. (1) Every contract made hereafter with the Government of Canada for construction, remodelling, repair or demolition of any work shall be subject to the following conditions respecting wages and hours:—

(a) All persons in the employ of the contractor, sub-contractor, or of any other person doing or contracting to do the whole or any part of the work contemplated by the contract shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current from time to time for competent workmen in the district in which the work is being performed for the character or class of work in which they are respectively engaged; provided that wages shall in all cases be such as are fair and reasonable;

Eight hour day.

(b) The working hours of persons while so employed shall not exceed eight hours per day except in such special cases as the Governor in Council may otherwise provide, or except in cases of emergency, as may be approved by the Minister.

(2) The provisions of this section shall not apply to persons employed in the fabrication or manufacture of materials, supplies or equipment for use in the work contemplated where such fabrication or manufacture is carried on in any established plant or factory other than a plant or factory established for the purposes of the work contemplated.

Exception. Workmen employed by the Government.

4. The wages and hours of all workmen employed by the Government of Canada on such works as are described in section three, and who are excluded from the operation of the Civil Service Act, shall be those set forth in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section three.

5. (1) The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, may make regulations with regard to wages and hours herein provided for and without limiting the generality of the foregoing may provide by regulation for

- (a) the method of determining what are current or fair and reasonable wages and the preparation and use of schedules of rates relating thereto;
- (b) rates of wages for overtime;
- (c) classifications of employment or work;
- (d) the publication and posting of wage schedules;
- (e) payment of wages to employees in case of default by the contractor or other party charged with such payment and recovery thereof from such contractor or other party;
- (f) the keeping of proper books and records and the examination of the same by Government officers;
- (g) persons who may be employed on works referred to in this Act;
- (h) the subletting of contracts;
- (i) the penalties to be imposed for breaches of the provisions of this Act or regulations made hereunder.
- (j) generally for the due enforcement of the provisions of the Act and regulations.

(2) All regulations made under this Act shall fifteen days after the date of the first publication thereof in *Canada Gazette* have the same force and effect as if they had been included herein.

Force and
effect of
regulations.

APPENDIX "C"

EIGHT-HOUR DAY FOR DOMINION GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

ORDER IN COUNCIL, P.C. 670 APPROVED BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL ON THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 1930.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated March 19, 1930, from the Minister of Labour, submitting as follows:—

1. That it was recognized in the Labour Part of the Treaty of Versailles and the corresponding provisions of the other Treaties of Peace, that the well-being—physical, moral and intellectual—of industrial wage earners is of supreme international importance, and that although differences of climate, habits and customs, economic principles and industrial traditions, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment, there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply, so far as their special circumstances will permit.

2. That approval was expressed in the Peace Treaties of the principle of the eight-hour working day.

3. That a Draft Convention was adopted at the first session of the Conference of the International Labour Organization (League of Nations) in 1919 to limit hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight hours per day.

4. That the Draft Convention above mentioned was referred in 1924 to the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations of the House of Commons of Canada for examination and report.

5. That on the recommendation of the Committee on Industrial and International Relations of the House of Commons, approved by the House of Commons, the Draft Convention on hours of work in industrial undertakings was referred by Order in Council to the Supreme Court of Canada with a view to determining the jurisdiction of the federal and provincial authorities, respectively, on this subject.

6. That the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada contained the following declaration: "The subject matter is generally within the competence of the legislatures of the provinces but the authority vested in these legislatures does not enable them to give the force of law to provisions such as those contained in the Draft Convention in relation to servants of the Dominion Government, or to legislate for those parts of Canada which are not within the boundaries of a province.

7. That a report from the Civil Service Commission, which was submitted to Your Excellency in Council under date of February 16, 1925, showed that the standard daily hours of work of monthly rate employees in the Government departments are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. with an interval for luncheon and a half-holiday on Saturday, and that the standard hours of prevailing rate employees, numbering 1,576 in Ottawa and 18,264 outside Ottawa (of whom 12,247 were postmasters paid on percentage basis), are 44 hours per week, based on an eight-hour day for five days, and 4 hours for a half-day, on Saturday. Certain exceptions to these standard hours of work were also noted in the report of the Civil Service Commission.

8. That request has been made to the Government for the granting of the eight-hour day to its own employees.

9. That it is desirable that the principle of the eight-hour day should be applied to any branches of the public service of Canada in which it is not now observed.

The Minister accordingly recommends that, except in cases where the work of employees is intermittent in character, or the application of this rule is not deemed to be practicable or in the public interest, the hours of work of any employees of the Dominion Government who are still required to work more than eight hours daily be reduced to eight hours daily, with a half-holiday on Saturday.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

(Sgd.) E. J. LEMAIRE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

APPENDIX "D"

COPY OF A REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL APPROVED BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL ON THE 7TH MAY, 1930.

P.C. 970.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 6th May, 1930, from the Minister of Labour, directing attention to the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of Tuesday, March 27, 1928, and Thursday, March 29, 1928; and more specifically to the second report presented to the House from the Select Standing Committee on Industrial and International Relations and to the record of the adoption of the said report by the House, contained therein.

It will be observed that by adopting the said report the House endorsed the principle of the establishment by the Government of a National Civil Service Council, composed of representatives of the Government and the organized Civil Service in equal numbers, to consider and advise the Government upon matters of mutual concern to the Government and civil servants in their respective capacities as employer and employees, also as to the establishing of any other consultative and advisory machinery that may be required. And further, the House agreed that, as the form of constitution for such a council, covering its scope and functions, can best be determined by joint agreement between the parties concerned, a committee should be set up by the Government, representing both the Government and the civil service organizations, to draft a constitution for such a National Civil Service Council, any such constitution to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Having in mind the foregoing, the Minister submits that the time would now appear appropriate for the taking of the initial step suggested by the report above quoted.

The committee, therefore, submit for Your Excellency's approval the following recommendations of the Minister of Labour.

1. That a National Civil Service Council Drafting Committee should forthwith be constituted, to draft a constitution for a National Civil Service Council.

2. In establishing such a committee there first arises the question of its membership. The policy of giving equal representation to civil service organizations and to the Government should be observed.

3. Representation of civil service organizations:—

The Department of Labour has record of some twenty-eight organizations of civil servants throughout the country, varying, in respect of their memberships from about seventeen to over eight thousand. Obviously, with such a comparatively large number of organizations existing, giving direct representation to them all would not be practicable, in view of the fact that the setting up of a committee of at least fifty-six members would be involved thereby. Selecting those organizations reporting five hundred or more members, it is observed that there are ten which fall into this category. These organizations represent substantially all classes of civil servants organized, covering practically all branches of the service in which there is organization, and they include an overwhelming majority of the organized civil service. These ten organizations should be given representation on the committee. While not directly represented under this plan, several of the smaller organizations will be represented through affiliation with one or other of the larger bodies. In order to represent as many bodies as may be possible while still limiting the size of the committee to a reasonable figure, numerical differences among organizations should be overlooked when determining representation, and if each of these ten organizations had one representative to speak for it, though these differences in size exist, the representation would be as satisfactory as would be practical in the circumstances. Moreover, as an approach to unanimity on the part of all those interested is desirable, voting strength is unimportant. It is therefore recommended that each of the following organizations be invited to select one of the members of the aforementioned committee:—

1. Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.
2. Civil Service Association of Ottawa.
3. Civil Service Federation of Canada.
4. Dominion Customs and Excise Officers' Association.
5. United Postal Employees of Canada.
6. Dominion Public Works Federation.
7. Dominion Railway Mail Clerks Federation.

8. Federated Association of Letter Carriers.
9. Halcyon Club of Ottawa.
10. Professional Institute of Civil Servants.

4. Representation of the Government:—

To constitute the Government's side of the Committee, it is recommended that the Minister in charge of each of the undermentioned Departments, or such other person as he may designate, shall act to represent the interests of his department, and, in a general way, of the Government. The Departments selected are those which are considered to have a chief interest in the question of a National Civil Service Council. These Departments are as follows:—

1. Department of External Affairs.
2. Department of Finance.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labour.
6. Department of National Revenue.
7. Post Office Department.
8. Public Works Department.
9. Department of Secretary of State.
10. Department of Trade and Commerce.

5. Civil Service Commission—There shall be one representative of the Civil Service Commission named to the Committee.

6. It is recommended that the Chairman of the Committee shall be a Minister, to be named by the Governor in Council.

7. Procedure:—

The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman. In order to expedite the business of the committee, and in order that a constitution may be drafted which will be acceptable to both the Government representatives and to the civil service organizations, the latter should empower their representatives to speak in their behalf.

8. While the Committee should consider all matters deemed by it to be relevant to the subject of reference, the following questions are suggested for consideration as a guide:—

- (a) What should be the size of a National Civil Service Council?
- (b) How should its members be chosen?
- (c) What should be the scope of the Council's discussions?
- (d) What should be the general limits of the Council's functions?

9. The Committee shall likewise consider any written statements on the subject submitted by those organizations not directly represented.

10. After the Committee has concluded its deliberations, its report shall be submitted to the Governor in Council for consideration and approval.

11. It is recommended that travelling expenses incidental to attending the committee's meetings incurred by those attending from points other than Ottawa, should be defrayed by the Government. It is further recommended that civil service organizations' representatives attending the meetings of the Committee shall be accorded special leave of absence with pay for the purpose, by their respective Departments.

(Signed) E. J. LEMAIRE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

APPENDIX "E"

POSITIONS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA

1. *Entirely Excluded from the Civil Service Act*

Employees on Government Railways (Section 38A, Chapter 12, 8-9 George V).

Employees on Ships of His Majesty (Section 38A, Chapter 12, 8-9 George V).

Employees of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Chapter 67, 14-15 George V).

Employees of the Federal Appeal Board (Chapter 62, 13-14 George V).

Inspector General of Banks and Staff (Chapter 7, 14-15 George V).

Staff of the Honorary Advisory Council (Chapter 64, 14-15 George V).

Chief Electoral Officer and Staff (Chapter 46, 10-11 George V).

Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Chapter 91, R.S.).

Temporary employees under Combines Investigation Act (Chapter 9, 13-14 George V).

Board of Audit and Staff (Chapter 32, 15-16 George V).

Appeal Inspectors under Grain Act (Chapter 33, 15-16 George V).

Inspectors under Explosives Act (Chapter 31, 4-5 George V).

All positions where the salary does not exceed \$200 per annum (P.C. 1053, June 29, 1922).

Postmasters of Revenue Offices where revenue does not exceed \$400 per annum (P.C. 17/1751, Sept. 12, 1929).

All positions for which the compensation provided is fees of office, and positions of an honorary character to which no compensation is attached (P.C. 1053, June 29, 1922).

Employees of the Soldier Settlement Board (P.C. 370, Feb. 21/20, P.C. 587, March 23/20, P.C. 2634, Dec. 22/22, P.C. 97/851, May 30/25, P.C. 79/436, March 13/29).

Manager, Parliamentary Restaurant (P.C. 279, Feb. 5, 1921).

Chaplain (P.C. 5/200, Jan. 31, 1922).

Office Staff of the Commercial Intelligence Service outside the Dominion of Canada (not including Trade Commissioners and Assistant Trade Commissioners). (P.C. 318, Feb. 10, 1922.)

Assistant Clerk of the House of Commons (P.C. 1, Jan. 5, 1925).

Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Commons (P.C. 1, Jan. 5, 1925).

Special Preventive Service, Department of National Revenue (Vote 343, 1928-9, and Chapter 37, 18-19 George V).

Dominion Appraisers, Department of National Revenue (Vote 343, 1928-29, and Chapter 37, 18-19 George V).

Taxation Branch, Department of National Revenue (Vote 308, 1929-30).

Loan Staff, Department of Finance (Vote 1, 1929-30).

Advisors in Tariff Enquiry (Vote 270, 1929-30).

Legation Staffs at Washington, Paris and Tokyo (Votes 252, 253, and 254, 1929-30).

Farm Loan Board (Chapter 66, R.S. 1927).

2. *Excluded from the Civil Service Act, except that they must be classified if continued for a period of of more than six months.*

Clerical and lower grade positions in Dominion Government Offices outside the Dominion of Canada, not including supervisory or administrative positions (P.C. 8/200, Jan. 31, 1922).

Orderly, Office of the Governor General's Secretary (P.C. 1053, June 29, 1922).

Indian Interpreter, Department of Indian Affairs (P.C. 1053, June 29, 1922).

Port Physicians, Department of Health, at:

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Alberni	Ladysmith	Powell River
Anyox	Nanaimo	Prince Rupert
Buckley Bay	New Westminster	Union Bay
Chemainus	Ocean Falls	Vancouver
Duncan	Port Alice	Victoria

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK

Alma	Dalhousie	Shippigan
Albert	Grand Harbour	St. Andrews
Back Bay	Hillsboro	St. George
Bathurst	Moncton	St. Marins
Campbellton	North Head	St. Stephens
Cape Tormentine	Richibucto	Tracadie
Caraquet	Shediac	

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA

Advocate Harbour	Freeport	Pictou
Amherst	Glace Bay	Port Greville
Annapolis Royal	Hantsport	Port Hawkesbury
Antigonish	Kentville	Port La Tour
Arichat	Liverpool	Port Midway
Baddeck	Lockeport	Port Morien
Barrington	Louisburg	Pubnico
Barton	Lunenburg	Sandy Cove
Bear River	Mahone Bay	Shelbourne
Bridgewater	Margaree	Springhill
Bridgetown	Margaretsville	St. Peters
Canso	Meteghan	Sydney
Cheticamp	Middleton	Westport
Clark's Harbour	New Glasgow	Weymouth
Clementsport	North Sydney	Windsor
Digby	Parrsboro	Yarmouth
East La Have		

PROVINCE OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Alberton	Montague	Souris
Crapaud	Murray Harbour	Summerside
Georgetown	Rustice	Tignish

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Chicoutimi	Percé	Sorel
Gaspé	Port Alfred	St. Johns
Magdalen Island	Rimouski	Three Rivers
Paspebiac		

(P.C. 1053, June 29/22, P.C. 2241, Oct. 27/22, P.C. 782, May 2/23, P.C. 1101, June 20/23, P.C. 1941, Nov. 14/24, P.C. 2005, Nov. 20/24, and P.C. 22/436, March 24/25.)

Positions in the skilled and unskilled labour and domestic service classes as follows:—

Armature Winder	Farm Hand
Assistant Carpenter Foreman	Fireman
Assistant Electrician Foreman	Fireman-Labourer
Assistant Labour Foreman	Fireman's Helper
Assistant Mason Foreman	Fitter (Machinist)
Assistant Painter Foreman	Foreman of Dredge Repairs
Assistant Plumber and Pipe Fitter	Fruit Canner
Foreman	Garage Man
Automobile Mechanic	Gas Engine Foreman
Barber	Gas Engineman
Blacksmith	Grain Hold Boss
Blacksmith Apprentice	Grain Rigger
Blacksmith Foreman	Grain Scooper
Blacksmith's Helper	Hay Inspector
Boilermaker	Head Chauffeur
Boilermaker Apprentice	Head Waitress
Boilermaker Foreman	Housekeeper
Boilermaker's Helper	House Maid
Boom Master	Immigration Hall Attendant
Cabinet Maker	Kitchen Helper
Camp Cook	Labourer
Carpenter	Labourer Foreman
Carpenter Construction Foreman	Laundress
Carpenter Foreman	Lineman
Carpenter Foreman (Ship Construction)	Locksmith
Carpenter's Helper	Locksmith Foreman
Carpenter (Ship Construction)	Locomotive Fireman
Caulker	Machinist
Caulker Foreman	Machinist Apprentice
Charwoman	Machinist's Boy
Chauffeur	Machinist Foreman
Coat Room Attendant (Female)	Machinist's Helper
Cook	Mason
Cooper	Mason Foreman
Cooper's Helper	Mason's Helper
Coppersmith	Matron
Coppersmith's Helper	Mill Foreman
Culler	Miller
Cupola Tender	Milling Machinist
Derrickman	Millwright
Diver	Millwright's Helper
Diver's Assistant	Moulder
Dynamo Tender	Moulder Foreman
Electrician	Mould Loft Foreman
Electrician Foreman	Moulder's Helper
Electrician's Apprentice	Oakum Spinner
Electrician's Helper	Packmaster
Electric Lineman	Painter
Electric Lineman Foreman	Painter and Paper Hanger
Electric Power Plant Operator	Painter Foreman
Electric Wireman	Pattern-maker
Elevator Repairman	Pattern-maker Apprentice
	Pattern-maker Foreman

Positions in the skilled and unskilled labour and domestic service classes as follows:—*Continued*

Pattern-maker's Helper	Saw Mill Foreman
Plasterer	Sawyer
Plumber and Pipe-fitter	Sheet Metal Worker
Plumber and Pipe-fitter Foreman	Shipwright
Plumber and Pipe-fitter's Helper	Shipwright Foreman
Process Welder	Shipwright's Helper
Quarry Cutter	Sign Painter
Quarryman	Slide Master
Railway Section Foreman	Stable Boss
Railway Signal Repairman	Stonecutter
Repair Woman	Tailor
Rigger	Teamster
Rigger Foreman	Template Maker
Rigger's Helper	Tile and Cement Worker
Riveter	Tile Layer
Roofer	Toolmaker
Roofer's Helper	Train Conductor
Saddler's Helper	Upholsterer
Sail Maker	Waiter
Sail Maker Foreman	Waitress
Sail Maker's Helper	Wood Turner

(P.C. 1053, June 29/22, P.C. 2633, Dec. 22/22, and P.C. 477, March 29/23.)
Graduate Nurse (Indian Reserve), and Nurse (Indian Reserve), (P.C. 24/2588, Dec. 16, 1922).

Hospital Attendant, Department of Indian Affairs (P.C. 37/524, March 31, 1924).

Seamstress, Department of Indian Affairs (P.C. 37/524, March 31, 1924).

Field Matron, Department of Indian Affairs (P.C. 40/291, Feb. 24, 1925).

Travelling Nurse, Department of Indian Affairs (P.C. 122/1394, Aug. 22, 1925).

Secretary to Executive to Chief Commissioner, Board of Railway Commissioners (P.C. 8/291, Feb. 24, 1925).

3. *Exempt from the principle of competition in appointment, but otherwise under the Civil Service Act.*

The following positions in the office of a Minister of the Crown administering a department, including Solicitor General:—

One Secretary to Executive.

One Clerk, Grade 4, or, one Stenographer, Grade 3.

One Stenographer, Grade 2.

One Confidential Messenger.

(P.C. 323, Feb. 10/22, P.C. 8/1966, Dec. 2/26, P.C. 86/829, May 5/27, and P.C. 37/1147, June 16/27).

Indian Farming Instructor (P.C. 50/1219, June 9, 1922).

Head Gardener (Rideau Hall), (P.C. 36/1702, Aug. 21, 1922).

Park Superintendent, Lobster Bay, Quebec (P.C. 36/2214, Oct. 20, 1922).

Movable Equipment Engineer, Fort Simpson, Northwest Territories (P.C. 23/2588, Dec. 16, 1922).

Park Caretakers (Golf Instructors), Banff and Jasper, Alta. (P.C. 25/2687, Dec. 30, 1922).

Indian Agent and Medical Officer, Seven Islands Agency, Quebec (P.C. 45/76, Jan. 15, 1923).

- Indian Agent and Physician, Fort Resolution, Northwest Territories (P.C. 43-505, March 20, 1923).
- Constable, Bersimis Indian Reserve, Quebec (P.C. 74/1887, Oct. 24, 1924).
- Lightkeeper, Belle Isle North End, Nfld. (P.C. 178/442, March 23, 1926).
- Graduate Nurse, Department of Health, Leper Station, Bentinck Island (P.C. 49/1147, June 16, 1927).
- Medical Officer, Grade 1, Belfast, Ireland, (P.C. 20/81, January 16, 1928).
- Principal Clerk, Immigration Medical Inspection Branch, London, England. (P.C. 39/1130, June 28, 1928).
- Clerk, Grade 4, Immigration Medical Inspection Branch, London, England. (P.C. 23/1588, August 31, 1928).
- Physician (Part-time), White Horse and Carcross, Y.T. (P.C. 101/487, March 21, 1929).

4. *Wholly under the Civil Service Act*

All other positions.

APPENDIX "F"

19-20 GEORGE V

CHAP. 38

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries)

(Assented to 14th June, 1929)

His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. Section sixty of the Civil Service Act, chapter twenty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1927, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

"60. (1) Any person may be appointed by a minister of the Crown or other member of the Government or by the Leader of the Opposition to be his private secretary.

"(2) If such person holds a permanent position in the civil service he may be paid an additional salary not exceeding six hundred dollars a year whilst so acting; but if he does not hold a permanent position in the civil service, he may be paid such salary as the Governor in Council may prescribe, and in the event of the Minister or other member of the Government, or the Leader of the Opposition for whom he is acting as secretary, ceasing to be a minister or member of the Government or to be the Leader of the Opposition, as the case may be, the said secretary shall thereupon be appointed to a permanent position in the public service classified not lower than that of chief clerk, provided that the said secretary has been acting as such for a period of not less than one year.

"(3) No salary shall be payable to any private secretary unless the amount has been voted by Parliament."

Dr. A. E. CAMERON, called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Dr. Cameron, would you be so good as to tell us so that it will appear on the record whom you represent.—A. The Professional Institute of the Civil Service of Canada.

Q. Will you just proceed, Doctor.—A. The Professional Institute of the Civil Service of Canada was formed in 1920 “to enhance the usefulness of the service to the public, to maintain high professional standards, and to promote the welfare of its members.”

The Institute numbers about 1,100 members from all parts of Canada, embracing 32 professional groups and 7 regional groups as shown in the appendix. Approximately 70 per cent of the professional and technical personnel of the service is included.

The Institute wishes to present the following points for the consideration of the Select Special Committee:—

1. The Institute has always approved of, and supported the principle embodied in the Civil Service Act, and now wishes to reaffirm its unswerving belief in the merit system of appointments to and promotions in the Public Service.

I might say the Professional Institute is opposed to patronage in any form. The late Dr. Rutherford used a very apt quotation in this regard, which may be found in the 10th chapter of St. John the 1st verse.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Are you not going to give us the quotation?—A. Yes, I can give it to you, Mr. Chairman:—

Verily, verily I say unto you “he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.”

The second point:—

We would strongly recommend that provision be made in the Civil Service regulations, under proper safeguards, to enable officers to take leave of absence with pay, or to accumulate holidays for the purpose of pursuing post-graduate studies or undertaking departmental research work at educational institutions. Such a policy would result in increasing the efficiency of the professional and technical men of the service, who would thus be enabled to keep abreast of progress.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What are the number of holidays you get?—A. Eighteen days per annum, 18 working days. The rapid advance in the newer sciences, such as biochemistry, renders it imperative to keep in touch with progress, and certain post-graduate courses cater to this. Government research problems might be carried on by professional officers in university laboratories while taking such courses, and research requirements for higher degrees may be fulfilled in government laboratories by certain officers as part of their regular work. Young professional men entering the services have acquired the degrees necessary for commencing work in their particular occupations, but with added experience and ambition they desire further study to increase their knowledge and obtain more advanced degrees to fit them for higher positions.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Is there any additional leave granted to members in the professional service?—A. Not for the purpose I have just stated, sir. Some departments do make arrangements that do permit for that sort of thing.

Q. Special leave is granted?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, you would not make a recommendation that the committee set forward a definite increased period of holidays, would you?—A. No, sir. It is

mainly so that a professional employee could accumulate his leave. At the present time you may carry your leave over one year but you have got to take that carried over leave in the ensuing year or you lose it.

Q. That is, you would suggest that the Act be amended so that leave could be carried over for more than the one year?—A. I think that could be done by a regulation.

Mr. MACINNIS: In my opinion this request is perfectly reasonable and logical providing you have the necessary safeguards.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do, too, but I just do not know what recommendation this committee could make, if special leave is being granted at the present time. The leave that one in the professional service would want would depend entirely upon what course he wished to pursue, and the purpose of the leave, so that you could hardly make a general regulation, could you, that would cover the matter?

Mr. MACINNIS: We could make a general recommendation.

The WITNESS: I think that would be sufficient.

Mr. MACINNIS: I suppose the scope of the regulation covering the leave would have to be worked out.

The WITNESS: I think if the recommendation were made the department would probably arrange it.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Speaking generally, doctor, are the departments fairly reasonable in giving special leave?—A. Well, there are great differences; that is one of the troubles. One department will encourage it and the other will put obstacles in the way.

Q. So that even if we did make a general recommendation you would be more or less at the mercy of the opinion of the deputy in charge?—A. Well, you are bound to have the approval of the deputy minister in any case, sir.

Q. Yes, but I say if we did bring in a general recommendation it would still be up to the deputy to make the final decision?—A. Quite so, but I think its moral effect would be worth while.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Would not there have to be legislation in that respect?—A. I do not think so. You see, one of the requests is that they be allowed to accumulate leave. There are special advantages given to civil servants in some universities, and in order to take advantage of these privileges very often, financially, a man cannot do it if he is a married man.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Say a department has a specialist and he wants to go out and specialize on something particularly for the benefit of the department, would you like to have it so that he should be able to get that leave, so that instead of taking 3 weeks holidays he could probably take a month or six weeks and become a specialist in that particular work to the benefit of the department?—A. It means more than that, sir. What they want to do is to accumulate their leave for say three or four years in order that they could take up a course at a university and get a degree. The degree is not of immediate necessity to the government but it is a hall mark to the man which carries weight.

Q. You want that for the purpose of studies?—A. Yes.

Q. For the purpose of obtaining degrees?—A. Yes.

Q. I thought at first it was for the purpose of probably continuing research work for the benefit of the department, because in that case I should think there

would be no difficulty.—A. They run concurrently in many cases; they are synonymous in many cases; the research work that brings the man his degree is government work.

Q. There would have to be a great deal of elasticity in any recommendation which we might make. As you say, the moral effect of a recommendation coming from this committee would go a long way, is that it?—A. I think so, sir.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. It would only be used, I suppose, where a person was willing to sacrifice something, for improvement and possibly benefit to the department as well as to himself?—A. Quite.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think the point is well taken.

The WITNESS: The third point is:—

We recommend that section 13 of the Civil Service Act be amended to permit permanent appointments to be made at a higher rate of pay than the minimum of the class in special or unusual instances where the public interest would be served to better advantage.

This is intended to cover only very special cases where the candidate is specially qualified and is earning more than the minimum of the class and might possibly be available at one of the higher rates within the class. It very rarely arises but there have been cases of where particularly to-day men could not be obtained because of that.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I suppose the difficulties there are coming in conflict with someone else in the service?—A. Yes. The fourth point is:—

We recommend that all promotions carry with them an increase in salary which at present is frequently lacking owing to overlapping salary raises, and that in such cases promotion should involve assignment to the next higher salary rate in the new grade to which promotion has been made.

With overlapping salary ranges it is actually possible for an employee to receive less during the ensuing year than he would have received if he had remained in his former classification. That, of course, is quite an exceptional case but it is possible, and it is brought about by the increases being granted quarterly, that is, a man who is appointed in February, his next annual increase should be in April.

Mr. MACINNIS: This seems to me to be a rather difficult point for the committee to make a recommendation on. I find it very hard to understand the situation. Is it not a matter of classification.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of classification for the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me that if the commission have over-lapping salaries which create a situation of that kind I presume they would do their best to get it straightened out.

The WITNESS: Of course, these differences in salary for the year are usually only a matter of \$5 or \$10, but in a promotion I think the principle is fair that a man should get more money.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. In Number 3, of course, the difficulty arises there, that if you recommend the appointment of a man that you think has special qualifications for a position, why put him on a grade or two. Is he really suitable? You are coming in con-

flict with those within the service who think that perhaps they have just as good qualifications for the position.—A. I would frankly say that this section might be open to abuse.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It always comes down to this, that it is very very hard in the professional and technical positions to get the proper men at the ordinary range of salary.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Quite so.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That has been the problem all along, but there are certain other technical and professional positions that no man wants to take up because he can get better salary outside.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Outside the service altogether.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the difficulty.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Dr. Cameron, probably the difficulty that you refer to under your 4th point is not confined exclusively to the people that you represent?—A. Oh, it is quite general I should say.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Putnam, you will have to straighten up a lot of these matters.

Mr. PUTNAM: A lot of them need to be straightened up, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: No. 5 is:—

We strongly recommend the repeal of Order in Council P.C. 1364, dated September 8, 1871, which imposes the cost of removal expenses upon a civil servant accepting a promotion to a position in another part of the country. This order has, in many cases, prevented civil servants from accepting promotion by reason of the fact that the cost of removal would offset additions to salary for several years. It is our opinion that the public interest is unfavourably affected by this regulation.

The best man for the job might be in British Columbia and he would find it quite prohibitive to make application, and that actually has happened.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We had that difficulty in 1923; that was up before the committee then.

The WITNESS: Yes, that has been up before. No. 6:—

We recommend that provision be made for payment for retirement leave in such a manner that the position may be filled immediately on discontinuance of work by the retiring employee.

Then the 7th point is:—

We recommend that Civil Service regulation No. 73 be amended so as to permit retiring leave to be based on aggregate service instead of continuous service, as at present.

That is a matter of temporary employees. No. 8:—

We view with disfavour the appointment of temporary employees to positions which are obviously permanent in character.

That has been brought up before. There are about 250 positions of a technical or scientific nature. Some of the employees filling these positions have been employed for 7 or 8 years at the lowest salary of the grade while the work is really permanent in character, and they are barred from the superannuation scheme, and may not take out Civil Service insurance. It would appear that section 38 of the Civil Service Act is being abused. There are something like 35 in the Entomological Branch, 25 in the Fruit Branch, and so on.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Doctor, the members of the committee have an appointment for a quarter to one, and perhaps you will be good enough to come back at four o'clock.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 12.45 p.m., to resume at 4 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee resumed at 4 p.m.

A. E. CAMERON, examination resumed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Will you please proceed, doctor.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think we had reached section 9 when we adjourned.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. This section was touched on by Mr. Phelan.—A. Yes. It reads:—

We fully realize the necessity of a body to adjust complaints of civil servants who feel they have been unjustly treated and strongly endorse the recommendation of the Select Special Committee of the House of Commons, 1932, in this regard, being section 21, page 930 of Minutes of Proceedings, No. 27 of the Committee, which reads as follows:—

“To facilitate the adjustment of complaints of a civil servant, where such complaints cannot otherwise be adjusted, your committee recommends that such complaints be adjudicated by a board consisting of a nominee of the civil servant organization of which complainant is a member, a nominee of the deputy head of the department affected, and a nominee of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.”

The Institute would like to know how action is initiated, whether on the request of the civil service organization or the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MACINNIS: In my opinion it is the civil servants that would have the complaints to take up; I think it would be up to the civil servant organization to take the matter up with the commission and ask for the appointment of a board.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think that is about the only way you could start things. I do not suppose the commission would start themselves in the matter. I think if there is any complaint or complaints the way to initiate the proceedings would be in the manner suggested by Mr. MacInnis.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think it was either Mr. Bland, or the report of the Civil Service Commission, that stated there did not seem to be any reason for calling this committee together.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think he said there were no complaints, or that there have been no complaints made to the commission. I should think the civil service organization should take the opportunity to put that into effect; that is the way to go at it.

The WITNESS: One particular case has been presented to the commission and that was the procedure adopted, but it just seems somewhat indefinite.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. As a matter of fact, do you not think that most of these matters would never come finally before the board, and if you got together with a representative from the commission that the matter would probably be settled without going any further, that is, the majority of cases?—A. Yes, perhaps that is so.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think we can very well leave it to you to get together.

The WITNESS: Section 10 reads:—

We are strongly of the opinion that present grades of professional employees are, in a great many cases, seriously inconsistent with the duties required of such employees. This was clearly proven and reported in the investigation of the Royal Commission on Professional and Technical Services, 1930, and we would request that the Civil Service Commission be instructed to prepare for the adoption of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. We believe such action would have an immediate effect in stabilizing technical services and in attracting to and retaining in the civil service professional officers of outstanding ability.

While it is realized this report will not likely be implemented for some time, it is submitted that the Civil Service Commission should be instructed to prepare for its implementation as it would require time to proceed with the adjustments in Appendix A of that report and such other adjustments as may be advisable and as are provided for in the report, so that when economic conditions have advanced towards normal the classifications for professional employees would be established. I am of the opinion the Civil Service Commission would welcome this instruction.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think that this committee ought to have a report from the Civil Service Commission on this clause before we could deal with it properly.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We can get that from Mr. Bland later on.

The WITNESS: Section 11 reads:—

We consider that where the Civil Service Commission is aware of the existence of anomalies in the organization or the classification of any department or as between departments it should be incumbent upon the commission to take cognizance of the fact and to effect the necessary adjustments.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Do you not think that is really the principle behind the setting up of the commission. It is quite true that they have not settled all the troubles that arise, and I do not suppose they ever will, at least all of them, but still that is really the principle behind the setting up of the commission, is it not, one of the main principles?—A. Yes, that is quite so. Section No. 12 reads:—

We favour the establishment of a Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on the civil service.

It seems desirable to have a permanent committee who could study civil service matters and advise parliament as the Civil Service Commission does not appear to have any spokesmen in parliament.

No. 13 reads:—

We are of the opinion that a permanent Parliamentary Committee on civil service matters, by familiarizing itself with the organization and work of the civil service, could do a great deal towards placing the Service in proper perspective before members of parliament and the country at large.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: You are loading quite a bit on the committee.

The WITNESS: There is quite a current belief amongst a large percentage of the population that members of the civil service are an indolent lot of people, simply parasites maintained at the public expense, holding positions as a result of political favour, and vastly overpaid, and for that work the government gives them superannuation.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. I hope that is not the general feeling of the public.—A. It is pretty general, sir.

Mr. MACINNIS: Positions are so hard to get these days that the general public look with a certain amount of prejudice at anyone who has a position.

The WITNESS: Yes. It would appear to be in the public interest that measures should be taken to enlighten the people, particularly in country districts. A high percentage of appointees are appointed as a result of competitive examination and by an independent body.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That is work, of course, that could very well be undertaken by many of the organizations that represent the civil servants.—A. We do so, sir, as far as possible, by radio and so on.

No. 14 reads:—

We are strongly of the opinion that chapter 38 of the statutes of Canada, 1929, 19-20 George V, being an Act to amend the Civil Service Act (Private Secretaries), should be rescinded in view of the fact that its application seriously affects normal and well-merited promotions in a large number of cases, resulting in unrest and dissatisfaction among the officers of the service so affected.

We have had that before. There appears to be no just reason why private secretaries should be so favoured.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not think you ought to be wasting any time on that, doctor. I think we are all pretty familiar with the argument.

The WITNESS: No. 15 reads:—

We are of the opinion that the terms of reference of the Select Special Committee of the House of Commons on the Civil Service Act are too restricted, and that for future special committees of this nature or for a Standing Committee on the Civil Service, the terms of reference might, with advantage, be broadened to include consideration to superannuation, insurance, and other matters of vital interest to the service not now within the scope of the committee.

We have some matters to bring up with regard to superannuation.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That have not been touched upon before, doctor?—A. I think the first part of it has not been touched, sir.

Q. All right?—A. These are the recommendations of the Professional Institute:—

In 1926, the Professional Institute submitted to Government a memorandum suggesting certain amendments to the Superannuation Act of 1924. Action on these and subsequent suggestions has been deferred pending the determination of the actuarial status of the superannuation fund established by Order in Council P.C. 45/1147 to keep account of the transactions under the Act.

Since the Department of Insurance has now submitted a report to the Minister of Finance on the actuarial status of the Fund, the Institute would request that consideration be given to the amendment of the Superannuation Act and the regulations thereunder in order to correct injustices and anomalies and to improve the status of the Fund from an actuarial standpoint. The Institute feels that certain of these injustices should be removed irrespective of the actuarial condition of the Fund.

The Institute recommends:—

(1) That the Government implement the understanding at the time the Superannuation Act was passed that the Government would contribute dollar for dollar with the contributors in the Civil Service by crediting the Superannuation Fund No. 5 with principal and interest equal to the contributions with interest, of the Civil Servants, including funds transferred from the Retirement Fund and back payments by those who had not contributed previously to coming under the Act. This would bring the Fund to about \$60,000,000.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What is it now?—A. \$41,000,000 is the balance at the end of this year.

Q. And the \$19,000,000 difference that you refer to, what portion of that would have to come from the government?—A. Approximately \$11,000,000.

Q. The other \$8,000,000 would be made up by the funds got from the way mentioned in this paragraph, that is, by paying up?—A. That is earned from the payment of money equal to the amount transferred from the Retirement Fund. It has not yet been put into the Fund. The original suggestion was to amortize the amount over a period of thirty years, and it would involve creating a fund of \$680,000 per annum. The quotations from Hansard are appended to this report. It was discussed quite definitely by the Hon. Mr. Robb and Mr. Malcolm, as chairman of the committee and the Hon. Mr. Robertson in the Senate.

Q. At the present time what the government does at the end of each year is to credit the account with the amount of interest, their share on the basis of dollar for dollar?—A. And also an amount equal to that contributed by the civil servant.

Q. Yes.—A. It is quite interesting to note that up to March 31, 1933, the government did not have to spend one cent in superannuation money outside the appropriations to meet their obligations. The contribution by civil servants each year was sufficient to cover all payments which have been made for the current year, only I think they had to take some of the interest for the current year in addition to the actual contributions. The actual number of retirements at this particular time, of course, probably explains that.

Q. Well, has not the government, as a matter of bookkeeping even, not transferred the correct amount of interest to this fund, only they have not paid any capital? I just want to know the fact, doctor. I understood from Mr. Phelan—
—A. I think not, sir. They have not included interest on their contribution transferred from the Retirement Fund. The amount of money transferred from the Fund had already been paid by the civil servants and interest is allowed on that, but the government has not made any capital contribution to meet that obligation nor have they paid any interest I believe. In fact, we understand they have been waiting on the actuarial report.

Q. Well now, that is not what I understood from Mr. Phelan. I remember questioning him about that. What I understood from Mr. Phelan was that it was more or less a bookkeeping proposition and that the fund was credited annually with the interest which the government figured that they owed.—A. That is so, sir, but for example in 1932 the contributions from the civil servants were

\$2,566,735.90 and the contribution from the government was \$2,228,625, and interest \$1,335,000. The total of the contributions from the government and the interest amounted to \$6,130,417.64. That is not in the statement, sir.

Q. Do you say that the government were waiting for some report?—A. The actuarial report on the status of the Superannuation Fund.

Q. It is in the course of preparation?—A. It has already been received by the Minister of Finance.

Q. When was it filed?—A. It is not officially filed, sir. We have been asking for a copy of it but it has not been officially considered. I have no doubt that the report will not be brought out in any great hurry because at the present time they will not want to produce any report which will involve appropriations. I think that is reasonable.

Q. I certainly see that many of these matters have to be adjusted. Whether or not we are in the best time for adjustments though is not quite so clear.—A. I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a matter that should be associated with any time of depression. The civil service is quite a permanent body and will go on indefinitely. The Superannuation Fund will be continuing long after there have been several other periods of depression and prosperity and it should be placed on a proper basis.

Q. Quite, I agree with that, but in some evidence submitted a meeting or so ago, in discussing the matter with Mr. Phelan my recollection is that he gave a figure of some \$200,000 or \$300,000 which would have to be contributed to this fund annually providing certain people were brought under the Civil Service Act and were given the benefits that accrue from being able to subscribe to this fund.—A. That is quite apart from the present status of the fund. If any more civil servants are brought under the Superannuation Act their contributions will have to be equalled by the government in order to maintain the stability of the fund.

Q. Quite so, and that is where the extra appropriation comes in?—A. Yes. Of course, actually it need not be a matter of money at the moment if they accept the obligation. Such a sum might be amortized over a period of years so that the government contribution would be quite small, just in the same way as the original contribution of something like \$11,000,000 from the Retirement Fund. The original idea was to amortize this fund so that it would be payable in 30 years. That has been carried out.

Q. To sum the matter up, very properly you say the government should come through and meet the obligations which they have already in the past agreed to in this Act.—A. Yes. And the Professional Institute is of the opinion that if they did so then the amendment which they have recommended will probably be reasonable and within the actuarial status.

The other recommendations with relation to this are as follows:—

(2) That all civil servants who are now contributing to the Retirement Fund be allowed to come under the Superannuation Fund if they so desire.

That has also been discussed previously.

No. 3 reads:—

(3) That all contributors who were employed in the civil service previous to war service and returned to the civil service upon completion of such war service be allowed to count for superannuation purposes the time spent on war service.

That also has been discussed.

No. 4 reads:—

(4) That in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, marriage, or abolition of office or voluntary retirement, the benefits to the contributor, his dependents or estate should not in any case be less than the total amount contributed by the employee during his period of service.

Section 5 reads:—

(5) That benefits in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, or abolition of office be determined in the same principles for periods under ten years, however short, as for periods of service of ten years and longer.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Going back to No. 4, supposing a person retires after ten years service what amount of what he has contributed to Superannuation Fund is returned to him?—A. If he retires of his own volition he gets his contributions.

Q. He gets his contributions?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, is there any circumstance under which he does not get the value of his contributions?—A. If he retires at nine years he would not get anything.

Q. Oh, he would not get anything?—A. No, and that, of course, is rather stringent.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Ten years is the minimum?—A. Yes, sir. This particular recommendation would not involve any large expenditure.

Q. It involves a further appropriation?—A. Yes, but there is a very definite matter of justice involved. If a man retired voluntarily after ten years he would get his contributions. It has actually happened that a man has been on his death bed and he got in his resignation and had it accepted before he died in order that the people who were dependent on him but who were not defined as dependents under the Act, could have that money. If he had died without resigning they would not have got anything. I have already read section 5; that is practically the same thing.

Section 6 reads:—

(6) That in the event of a contributor being transferred to a position with a lower salary or his position being reclassified to a lower salary grade, the contributor should be allowed the option of

(a) continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;

(b) contributing at the rate of his present salary with the benefits pertaining thereto.

(See Sec. 6, Par. 4 of the Act.)

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Explain that please.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. What is the regulation now?—A. The superannuation benefits are based on the average salary during the last five years service in the case of those who transferred from the Retirement Fund, and the last ten years in the case of those who came under the Act after 1924. Any reduction in salary, therefore, reduces the superannuation benefits. For example, if a contributor's salary has been reduced from \$3,000 to \$2,500, after ten years service, his superannuation

annuity after twenty years service would be based on \$2,500 salary (\$1,000), though for half the period of service he contributed on the basis of \$3,000, and if his salary had not been reduced he would have received an annuity of \$1,200. It is the privilege of contributing to the Superannuation Fund on your original position.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, all right.

The WITNESS: Section 7 reads:—

(7) That in the event of a contributor being retired due to abolition of office and subsequently re-employed at a lower salary, he should be allowed the option of:—

- (a) continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;
- (b) receiving the superannuation to which his terms of service entitles him as and when he was retired, in addition to the salary and other benefits pertaining to the new position. Further, that the fact that he is receiving benefits under the Superannuation Act should not prejudice his re-employment.

If that obtains, that a man gets work in any other way except in the government he would have his superannuation just the same; he has earned it, or he thinks he has. But it is quite clearly set out in the Order in Council dealing with it that all superannuation annuities cease upon reassignment to the public service. The explanation of that is also outlined there.

No. 8 reads:—

That the reports of the advisory committee on the Superannuation Act be made available by the treasury board to the civil service.

I would say in this respect that in Order in Council P.C. 2232, dated December 22, 1928, it was stated that:—

“In the opinion of the Minister of Finance, an Advisory Committee would facilitate the administration of the Superannuation Act and would promote a better understanding of the provisions and administration of the Act among civil servants generally.”

The Professional Institute feel that if you have no information as to what is being done you cannot possibly lead to a better understanding.

No. 9 reads:—

That contributors be allowed to retire voluntarily at the age of 60 years or upon the completion of 35 years of service.

This would permit employees to retire while they have still a prospect of a few years participation in the activities of life and at the same time advance promotions in the Service. I might say as to the retiring age in Great Britain that they have vastly greater privileges in the civil service than we have here. I do not think they even contribute to the Superannuation Fund. The longer a man is in the service the more holidays he gets and a few other things.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, I do not know that we are in the position to make comparisons. I do not know very much about it over there. Is that all, doctor?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. I thought that the Professional Institute would say something about the Beatty report. It has not been implemented yet but I thought you would also submit a further brief in answer to the Beatty report. Did you consider that side

of it?—A. Well, the only recommendation the Professional Institute has to make on that point is that the Civil Service Commission be instructed to prepare for its implementation. There is a great deal of work in that connection in seeing that the different classifications are put in the different grades, and then as soon as the Beatty report is considered for adoption they would be ready for it.

Q. I thought probably you would say something about it. To my mind that is a very important feature.—A. Well, it seems hopeless at the moment, sir, to hope to get increased salaries when we have a reduction of 10 per cent.

Q. I can appreciate that, but I would have liked to have had some expression of opinion on it. Maybe you thought it was not the proper time, but I thought that the committee should have something in connection with the Beatty report and not to let it die but rather keep it up to date.—A. There is no doubt whatever that the Professional Institute is in favour of the implementation of the Beatty report at the very earliest possible date.

Q. Well then, do you want to leave it at that?—A. I think that is all I have instructions for, Mr. Chevrier. Mr. Chairman, may I on behalf of the Professional Institute thank you and your committee for the very courteous hearing you have given to me.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thank you, doctor, too, for the clear brief which you have filed with us and the presentation which you have made on behalf of the Professional Institute.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much.

APPENDIX

LIST OF GROUPS

PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

1. Agriculturists.
2. Architects.
3. Astronomers.
4. Biologists and Anthropologists.
5. Canal Engineers.
6. Chemical, Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
7. Chemists.
8. Civil Engineers (not otherwise grouped).
9. Dominion Land Surveyors.
- 10.
11. Editors.
12. Electric & Hydro-Electric Engineers.
13. Entomologists.
14. Forest and Forest Products Engineers.
15. Geodetic Engineers.
16. General.
17. Geologists.
18. Hydraulic-Reclamation Engineers.
19. Hydrographic Engineers.
20. Marine Department Engineers.
- 21.
22. Patent Examiners.
23. Plant Pathologists.
24. Public Works Engineers.
25. Royal Military College (R.M.C.).
26. Solicitors.
27. Statisticians, Economists and Actuaries.

28. Survey Engineers.
29. Technical Translators.
30. Topographical Engineers.
31. Veterinarians.
32. Fisheries.
33. Medical.
34. Tariffs and Trade Investigators.

REGIONAL GROUPS

61. Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.
62. New Brunswick.
63. Quebec {
64. Ontario { Exclusive of Ottawa District.
65. Manitoba.
66. Saskatchewan and Alberta.
67. British Columbia and The Yukon Territory.

PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA

RECOMMENDATIONS TO SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT,
APRIL, 1934*Re Superannuation*

In 1926, the Professional Institute submitted to Government a memorandum suggesting certain amendments to the Superannuation Act of 1924. Action on these and subsequent suggestions has been deferred pending the determination of the actuarial status of the Superannuation Fund established by Order in Council P.C. 45/1147 to keep account of the transactions under the Act.

Since the Department of Insurance has now submitted a report to the Minister of Finance on the actuarial status of the Fund, the Institute would request that consideration be given to the amendment of the Superannuation Act and the regulations thereunder in order to correct injustices and anomalies and to improve the status of the Fund from an actuarial standpoint. The Institute feels that certain of these injustices should be removed irrespective of the actuarial condition of the Fund.

1. The Institute recommends that the Government implement the understanding at the time the Superannuation Act was passed that the Government would contribute dollar for dollar with the contributors in the Civil Service by crediting the Superannuation Fund No. 5 with principal and interest equal to the contributions, with interest, of the Civil Servants, including funds transferred from the Retirement Fund and back payments by those who had not contributed previously to coming under the Act. This would bring the Fund to about \$60,000,000.

2. That all Civil Servants who are now contributing to the Retirement Fund be allowed to come under the Superannuation Fund if they so desire.

3. That all contributors who were employed in the Civil Service previous to war service and returned to the Civil Service upon completion of such war service be allowed to count for superannuation purposes the time spent on war service.

4. That in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, marriage or abolition of office, or voluntary retirement, the benefits to the contributor, his dependents or estate should not in any case be less than the total amount contributed by the employee during his period of service.

5. That benefits in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, or abolition of office be determined on the same principles for periods under ten years, however short, as for periods of service of ten years and longer.

6. That in the event of a contributor being transferred to a position with a lower salary or his position being reclassified to a lower salary grade, the contributor should be allowed the option of:—

- (a) continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;
- (b) contributing at the rate of his present salary with the benefits pertaining thereto. (See Sec. 6, Par. 4, of the Act.)

7. That in the event of a contributor being retired due to abolition of office and subsequently re-employed at a lower salary, he should be allowed the option of:

- (a) Continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;
- (b) Receiving the superannuation to which his term of service entitles him as and when he was retired, in addition to the salary and other benefits pertaining to the new position.

8. That the reports of the Advisory Committee on the Superannuation Act be made available by the Treasury Board to the Civil Service.

9. That contributors be allowed to retire voluntarily at the age of 60 years or upon completion of 35 years' service.

PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA

RECOMMENDATIONS TO SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT, APRIL, 1934

In 1926, the Professional Institute submitted to Government a memorandum suggesting certain amendments to the Superannuation Act of 1924. Action on these and subsequent suggestions has been deferred pending the determination of the actuarial status of the superannuation fund established by Order in Council P.C. 45/1147 to keep account of the transactions under the Act.

Since the Department of Insurance has now submitted a report to the Minister of Finance on the actuarial status of the Fund, the Institute would request that consideration be given to the amendment of the Superannuation Act and the regulations thereunder in order to correct injustices and anomalies and to improve the status of the Fund from an actuarial standpoint. The Institute feels that certain of these injustices should be removed irrespective of the actuarial condition of the Fund.

The Institute recommends:—

(1) That the Government implement the understanding at the time the Superannuation Act was passed that the Government would contribute dollar for dollar with the contributors in the Civil Service by crediting the Superannuation Fund No. 5 with principal and interest equal to the contributions with interest, of the Civil Servants, including funds transferred from the Retirement Fund and back payments by those who had not contributed previously to coming under the Act. This would bring the Fund to over \$60,000,000.

Explanation

When the Superannuation Act was before the House of Commons in 1924, the Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Robb; the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Malcolm; and the leader of the Government in the

Senate, Hon. Mr. Robertson, all made it plain that as soon as the amount to be transferred from the Retirement Fund was ascertained, the Government would credit the Superannuation Fund with an equal amount, and it was suggested that, instead of doing so in one sum, the amount be amortized over thirty years. It was estimated that this would involve a book-keeping credit of about \$680,000 annually in addition to the contribution based on 5 per cent of the current salaries.

See House of Commons Debates, May 21, 1924, Appendix A.

See House of Commons Debates, July 3, 1924, Appendix B.

See Senate Debates, July 14, 1924.

Up to and including the fiscal year ending March 31, 1933, the receipts and disbursements of the Fund have been as follows:—

Contributions by Civil Service:

Transfers from Retirement Fund..	\$10,973,707 62
Annual contributions and arrears, less refunds.. . . .	17,688,485 34
Total Civil Service Contributions..	\$28,662,192 96
Contributions by Government..	12,925,249 35
Interest*..	7,307,977 11
Total Receipts..	48,895,419 42
Total Disbursements..	7,854,835 50
Balance on Hand..	41,040,583 92

*At least 70 per cent of the interest should be credited to Civil Service contributions.

The Institute does not consider that it is necessarily advisable to establish a separate cash fund since Dominion Government securities present the safest investment and therefore the placing of the fund on a secure and equitable basis would involve no outlay on the part of the Government beyond the present obligation to pay superannuation benefits as authorized by the Act.

In this connection it may be pointed out that up to March 31, 1933, Government has not had to pay out any money for superannuation benefits, the contributions of the civil servants (without interest) having been sufficient to pay all disbursements and in addition leave a balance of \$20,807,357 in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(2) That all Civil Servants who are now contributing to the Retirement Fund be allowed to come under the Superannuation Fund if they so desire.

Explanation

There are a great many who through misunderstanding of the Act or misjudgment failed to take advantage of the opportunity when it was offered in 1924-1927 or whose conditions have changed since that time, who now would like to come under the Act.

Many at outside points were so situated that they did not see the Act or have it explained to them. A number were unmarried at that time and did not appreciate the protection afforded to dependents or did not expect to remain in the Service long enough to qualify for the benefits.

A great many of these are comparatively young members of the Service with the expectation of a considerable number of years of contribution, and their credits in the Retirement Fund would increase the Superannuation Fund.

It may be noted that the Government has recently reduced the interest on contributions to the Retirement Fund from 5 per cent to 4 per cent, which may dispose those contributing to the Retirement Fund now to come under the Superannuation Act.

Also, payments to the Retirement Fund and interest thereon are subject to Federal Income Tax.

(3) That all contributors who were employed in the Civil Service previous to war service and returned to the Civil Service upon completion of such war service be allowed to count for superannuation purposes the time spent on war service.

Explanation

There are a number of contributors who by the nature of their employment were termed "temporary" or "seasonal" or "prevailing rates" employees, and who with the consent of their Chief Executives left their positions for war service and on their return again took up their work and were later blanketed into the Service permanently.

An amendment to the Act provides that all those who were blanketed in from outside Service might count for superannuation purposes any period of employment while previously engaged in the Civil Service, but not the time on war service. Those who were classed as "permanent," however, are allowed to count the time on war service. This is considered an injustice requiring adjustment. It is believed that certain cases can be adjusted under the Act by Order in Council.

Ruling of Department of Justice May 22, 1930, attached. Appendix D.

(4) That in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, marriage or abolition of office or voluntary retirement, the benefits to the contributor, his dependents or estate should not in any case be less than the total amount contributed by the employee during his period of service.

Explanation

Section 5 (iii) of the Act provides for the return of contributions in the event of voluntary retirement after ten years' service, but there is no provision for the return of contributions before the completion of ten years' service or in the event of death to the estate of the deceased who has no dependents as defined by the Act.

It is a well recognized fundamental principle, which should never be departed from in superannuation schemes, that the aggregate benefits paid should not in any case be less than the employee could have secured by retiring voluntarily. It is analogous to granting a larger cash surrender value than death benefit under an insurance policy. If this principle is departed from anomalies are bound to occur.

Cases have occurred where a contributor has been the main support of a parent, sister, brother, or child, and in order that such partial dependent may receive any benefit under the Act, it has been necessary to have the contributor submit a formal resignation and have it accepted before death.

In the event of death just after superannuation due to ill health and there being no dependents of the particular classes specified in the Act, one month's superannuation would be payable whereas if the contributor had resigned instead of accepting superannuation the contributions would have been returned in full.

It is perhaps sufficient to state these results to show that better co-ordination of benefits in varying circumstances is necessary. If this co-ordination is not established, then, in event of serious ill-health or approaching superannuation some employees will experience great anxiety in endeavouring to decide whether they should retire voluntarily or let events take their course. A superannuation scheme should remove anxiety in such circumstances rather than create it.

We are satisfied that the direct cost resulting from this amendment must, likewise, be relatively negligible. In view of the classes of depen-

dents and the benefits to which they are entitled under the Act, the proportion of cases when any additional benefit would be paid as a consequence of this amendment would be very small. We do not think it can be justifiable to depart from a fundamental principle in any case, and especially when the tangible gain must be negligible, and when there are involved such anomalies as those just mentioned, together with the anxiety put upon certain employees in circumstances in which everything possible should be done to remove anxiety.

(5) That benefits in the event of death, retirement due to ill health, or abolition of office be determined on the same principles for periods under ten years, however short, as for periods of service of ten years and longer.

Explanation

Sec. 7 of the Act allows a gratuity equivalent to one month's pay (8 per cent) for each year of service in the event of death, disablement or abolition of office before the completion of ten years' service, and in the event of retirement due to marriage in such cases an amount not exceeding the contribution. The pension principal should be applied in the case of death, ill health or abolition of office, but in the case of marriage and voluntary retirement, return of contributions should be sufficient.

The requirement of ten years' service deterred many electing to come under the Superannuation Act and it is unfair to enforce contributions from employees for which, through no fault of their own, they may receive no benefits.

While it is in the public interest to offer encouragement to Civil Servants to make the Service a career, the principle should not be carried to the extent of confiscating the contributions if an arbitrarily set term of service is not completed.

(6) That in the event of a contributor being transferred to a position with a lower salary or his position being reclassified to a lower salary grade, the contributor should be allowed the option of:—

- (a) continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;
- (b) of contributing at the rate of his present salary with the benefits pertaining thereto.

(See Sec. 6, Par. 4 of the Act.)

Explanation

The superannuation benefits are based on the average salary during the last five years' service in the case of those who transferred from the Retirement Fund, and the last ten years in the case of those who came under the Act after 1924.

Any reduction in salary, therefore, reduces the superannuation benefits.

For example, if a contributor's salary has been reduced from \$3,000 to \$2,500, after ten years' service, his superannuation annuity after twenty years' service would be based on \$2,500 salary (\$1,000), though for half the period of service he contributed on the basis of \$3,000 and if his salary had not been reduced he would have received an annuity of \$1,200.

(7) That in the event of a contributor being retired due to abolition of office and subsequently re-employed at a lower salary, he should be allowed the option of:—

- (a) continuing to contribute at the rate of 5 per cent of his former salary with commensurate benefits;

- (b) receiving the superannuation to which his term of service entitles him as and when he was retired, in addition to the salary and other benefits pertaining to the new position. Further, that the fact that he is receiving benefits under the Superannuation Act should not prejudice his re-employment.

Explanation

The present situation in regard to contributors who have been retired due to abolition of office and subsequently re-employed is as follows:—

All Superannuation Annuities cease upon reassignment to the Public Service.

In the case of one appointed to a temporary position, the contributor may continue to contribute on the basis of 5 per cent of his former salary and upon final retirement (voluntary or otherwise) he will receive superannuation benefits on the basis of his total term of employment at the salary rate upon which he contributed. In this case, he loses the annuities to which he is entitled during his period of re-employment.

If he is unable or unwilling to continue contributing on that basis, his superannuation benefits will be based on the term of employment during which he did contribute. In this case he loses not only the annuities during the time he was re-employed, but the credit for the time of such re-employment.

In the case of one who is reassigned to a permanent position, his superannuation on the basis of his former position is terminated and held in abeyance until final retirement and a new superannuation term is started with his re-employment. Upon final retirement he is entitled to receive the benefits of both terms, e.g.,

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 15 \text{ years at } \$3,000 & = & 15 \times \$3,000 = \$ 900 \\
 & & \underline{\hspace{1.5cm}} \\
 & & 50 \\
 15 \text{ years at } \$1,800 & = & 15 \times \$1,800 = \$ 540 \\
 & & \underline{\hspace{1.5cm}} \\
 & & 50 \qquad \qquad \qquad \$1,440
 \end{array}$$

If he had been allowed to contribute on the basis of his former salary for the second period, his annuity would be \$1,800. It would appear that if he retires voluntarily he will receive only the amount of his contributions, less any amount received as superannuation benefits.

If he had been allowed to draw his annuity on the first term, he would receive \$900 annuity plus \$1,800 salary, totalling \$2,700 during the time of his re-employment, and \$1,440 annuity upon final retirement.

- (8) That the reports of the Advisory Committee on the Superannuation Act be made available by the Treasury Board to the Civil Service.

Explanation

On the Advisory Committee the administrative side is represented by three officials of the Department of Finance, one official of the Department of Justice and one official of the Department of Insurance, and the employees side by one representative from each of the following civil service organizations: the Civil Service Federation, the Civil Service Association, the Professional Institute, the Postal Workers, and the Amalgamated Civil Servants.

At present the rules of the Committee require that its recommendations to Treasury Board be treated as confidential, and the representatives of the Civil Service organizations are not allowed to inform their organizations of the progress of matters of vital interest to them which have been

referred to the Advisory Committee. As a result the Civil Service has no information as to whether these matters have received the attention of the Committee or not or the nature of the recommendations which may have been made by this Committee.

It may be pointed out that in Order in Council P.C. 2232, dated December 22, 1928, it was stated that "In the opinion of the Minister (of Finance), an Advisory Committee would facilitate the administration of the Superannuation Act and would promote a better understanding of the provisions and administration of the Act among Civil Servants generally."

In the opinion of the Institute the objects would be better served if the actions taken by the Committee were made known.

(9) That contributors be allowed to retire voluntarily at the age of 60 years or upon completion of 35 years' service.

Explanation

This would permit employees to retire while they have still a prospect of a few years participation in the activities of life and at the same time would advance promotions in the service.

APPENDIX A

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES, MAY 21, 1924

(Original Edition)

Page 2473.

Mr. Robb had stated that if all transfer the annual cost to the government would be about \$1,435,000 on the basis of 5 per cent of the salaries.

Sir Henry Drayton asked how the balance credited to the old funds could be brought in.

Mr. ROBB: "It can only be brought in by the government appropriating an amount equal to the amount that is in those funds now."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "That is what I would think. So that in addition to the charge of \$1,435,000 there would also be an initial payment equal to the sum which is now to the credit of the civil servants in those funds."

Mr. ROBB: "A book-keeping payment."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "It really would be more than merely book-keeping. It would be an obligation."

Mr. ROBB: "It would be an obligation."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "An obligation just as real as those Canadian National Railway bonds; it would be something real. My honourable friend says it would be doubled. Why doubled? Would it not depend upon the ratio between those already covered by the existing schemes and those coming into the new scheme? I would not think you could handle it by the rough-and-ready way of doubling the balance."

Mr. ROBB: "My honourable friend might be right about that. There is Superannuation Fund No. 1 with 614 contributors and a credit of \$1,443,668; and Superannuation Fund No. 2 with 189 employees and a credit to that fund of \$416,980. The total of the Retirement Fund approximates \$12,000,555."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: "I do not think any mere rule-of-thumb of doubling the figures would work."

Mr. ROBB: "The committee will thresh all that out."

Page 2474.

Mr. ROBB: "The memorandum given me by the Superintendent of Insurance, who has carefully considered the legal aspects of the whole matter, says: 'Provision is made in the bill for the voluntary transfer to the new scheme of members now contributing to these funds, and the cost to the Government in respect of those members who transfer will be made up of two parts:—

1. The government's contributions in respect of their future services, and
2. The initial liability assumed by the government in respect of their past service, for which, with the exception of Superannuation Fund No. 2, the Government has made no contribution.

'With reference to No. 1 it may be stated that the cost to the Government for future service will be 5 per cent of the pay-roll. The difficulty arises in estimating how many will transfer and the annual salaries attaching to their positions. If all transfer, it will be seen that the government's contribution of 5 per cent would amount to approximately \$1,500,000. This would not mean that this amount would have to be actually disbursed, but would have to be dealt with in the same way as the contributions in respect of new entrants; that is, it would have to be recognized, ear-marked, and set aside to meet future liability'."

APPENDIX B

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES, JULY 3, 1924

(Revised Edition)

Page 3977.

Mr. James Malcolm, Chairman of Committee on Superannuation, quoting from the report of the Committee:—

"The general principles upon which modern superannuation schemes are based appear to be fairly definitely agreed upon. The basis most favoured is that under which both the employees and the employer contribute to the support of the scheme, the entire cost, as a rule, being borne approximately equally by both."

Page 3979.

Mr. MALCOLM: 14. "In all cases arrears of contributions may be paid in one sum or in equivalent instalments as may be prescribed by regulation.

"It is believed that the cost of the benefits proposed by the bill will be *equally borne* by the contributor and the government; that is, that the government's share of the cost will be 5 per cent of the salaries. There will be in addition an initial liability created in respect of the past services of persons now in the service who elect to come under the provisions of the Act. The amount of this liability will depend upon the number transferring, their length of service, and their dependents. On being ascertained, the amount of this initial liability can be extinguished by an annual charge extending over the probable period of service remaining to those contributors.

"That amount can be spread over a period of 25 to 30 years. In the case of the British Local Government scheme, it extends over 40 years."

Page 3983

Mr. ROBB, Minister of Finance, in answer to Sir Henry Drayton: "The present retirement fund amounts to approximately \$12,000,000 and that is the estimated initial liability of the government if all on that fund transfer. The annual apportionment over thirty years to extinguish this amount, at 4 per cent, would be \$680,000 a year. The annual salaries of contributors to the retire-

ment fund amount to \$28,000,000; 5 per cent thereof being the government's annual contribution \$1,400,000, and the total cost on the basis of present salary would be \$2,080,000 annually."

Page 3989

SIR HENRY DRAYTON: "**** If we have 100 per cent of the service coming in (from the retirement fund) what contribution should we now make in order to preserve the actuarial basis?"

MR. MALCOLM: "It is estimated that an amount equal to the \$12,000,000 now in the Retirement Fund will be sufficient together with five per cent of the salaries for the future. That \$12,000,000 can be amortized over thirty years and will as the Minister has pointed out cost the country about \$680,000 a year. The British Local government has a similar proposition and they amortized over a period of forty years. It is considered by the Minister advisable to amortize over thirty years, and the payment would be \$680,000."

APPENDIX C

SENATE DEBATES, JULY 14, 1924

Page 805

Discussing Retirement Fund:—

HON. MR. ROBERTSON: I am informed that the amount of principal in the fund is somewhere between \$9,000,000 and \$10,000,000 and that the interest that has accrued upon the payments made by the civil servants since 1889 aggregates more than \$3,000,000 additional.

HON. MR. GRIESBACH: Is that subject to call or is that the balance?

HON. MR. ROBERTSON: That is the balance on hand, I believe. It is now proposed that those 22,000 civil servants shall come under this new law, and the accumulated fund will create a nucleus of a fund to carry it on.

The Government now proposes to contribute 5 per cent also; so that the fund will be doubled and the amount employees are to receive will be increased, and will be extended to the widow and children under 18 years of age of the deceased Civil Servant, payment being made to the widow as long as she remains such. I think that part of the bill is entirely commendable.

* * * * *

HON. MR. ROBERTSON (*re* Retirement Refund): The Government has not contributed a single cent towards that fund: it was all accumulated as a result of the contributions of those Civil Servants. It is now proposed that the Government shall come in and be a partner in the superannuation scheme now before us, and pay an equal amount with the old Civil Servants and with those 15,000 Civil Servants who have not heretofore been regarded as permanent employees, although many of them have been in the government service for many years.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Esling, would you like to say a few words to the committee?

WM. J. ESLING, M.P.: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to say a few words on behalf of some employees of the Nelson and Trail, B.C., Post Offices. These are government buildings; they are revenue offices. Take first of all the case of Nelson. The postmaster there is a civil servant. In addition to the postmaster there are eleven employees.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: With regard to Nelson you say the postmaster is a civil servant?

MR. ESLING: Yes, and the postmaster at Trail is a civil servant.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What about the eleven employees at Nelson.

Mr. ESLING: The eleven employees are not. At Trail the postmaster is a civil servant and there are seven employees who are not. The post offices at Trail and Nelson are known as Grade 2B offices; they are just below a city office. Prior to 1930 the postmasters received the statutory commission from the revenue and engaged their own employees and paid them such salaries as they could hire them for.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That was prior to 1930?

Mr. ESLING: Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That does not exist now?

Mr. ESLING: No. In 1931 I think it was, these two offices were made Grade 2B offices. The postmasters were then made civil servants. The employees were still appointed by the postmasters but the government assured the salaries of these employees so that there would be some assurance that they would get at least a reasonable return for their services.

Now, we go back to the Nelson office. They ask—and Trail likewise—that they be taken into the civil service for the reason that in the year 1925 the Nelson office was taken under the administration of the Civil Service Act but, for some reason, they remained there only one month and then they were put back on to a revenue basis, and they point out that had they been continued in the civil service next year they would have had ten years advantage of superannuation. The postmaster points out the disadvantage of not being in the civil service because the post office employee, as a rule, is not very generously paid, and he says that while he is able to secure efficiency in the staff under present conditions just as soon as times improve and these employees can secure better positions at more lucrative salaries they are going to take the better positions and the service is thereby jeopardized. They, therefore, ask that they be taken under the Civil Service Act with the benefits under the Act.

They also point out that the Nelson office is the fourth in point of revenue in the province of British Columbia, its revenue being something like \$44,000. The Trail post office is fifth in point of revenue, and there are two offices I understand—I think one is Prince Rupert—which although having less revenue are under the Civil Service Act.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: You mean Trail is entirely under the Civil Service Act now and Nelson is not?

Mr. ESLING: No. I said Prince Rupert and one other office, the revenues of which are much less than either Nelson or Trail.

A further contention in support of their request to come under the Civil Service Act is the fact that the revenue of Nelson is so great as to be about \$2,000 in excess—I may be wrong about the \$2,000, but between \$1,200 and \$2,000 in excess of what it formerly cost the government to run that office. You will remember in revenue offices the postmaster received a commission of 70 per cent on the first \$1,000 of revenue, including the sale of stamps and postal notes, and 30 per cent on the next thousand, and then I believe it graduated after \$10,000. Well now, under the present Grade 2B system there is an excess over what there would have been before. Of course, there was an excess before but it all went to the postmaster. Now the government gets the benefit of that, and by reason of that fact Nelson particularly feels that it is entitled to come under the Civil Service administration. However, the Post Office Department takes the ground that this is no time, that they are not in a position to do anything which will increase expenditures.

I merely wanted to place before the committee the request of employees of the Nelson and Trail post offices, which are Federal buildings, where the post-

masters are civil servants, where the government fixes the salaries of employees and where the employees have no hope of the future.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Esling retires, I would suggest in order to facilitate the work of the committee that we get something from the Post Office officials. Mr. Bland is here. Why should not the Civil Service Commission also furnish us with a statement so that then we would have the set-up and we will not have to go all over the place to get information.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The only thing about the matter is this, Mr. Chevrier, that we as a committee have not got the authority.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh well, that is another question.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We cannot do anything more than pass Mr. Esling's representations on to the department. Our reference is quite clear under the Act.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was not looking at that side of it now, but in case we did decide to do anything later on then we would have all that evidence.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, we can consider that viewpoint. Thanks very much, Mr. Esling.

J. A. MACISAAC, called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What are your initials, Mr. MacIsaac?—A. J. A.

Q. And the position which you occupy?—A. I am president of the Civil Service Association of Ottawa.

Q. Representing?—A. 3,700 civil servants located in the City of Ottawa. Its membership is drawn from all departments, commissions, etc., in the service confined, as I said before, almost entirely to memberships within the Service. We have a number of small groups located in outlying districts, civil servants who have not had an opportunity of organizing for the reason that their groups were comparatively small and they were anxious to keep in touch with civil service matters, so that our association was pleased to accept membership and keep them in touch with civil service matters, and affairs in so far as possible. Apart from a few hundred, the other thousands are located in the City of Ottawa.

My representations this afternoon will be comparatively brief, Mr. Chairman for the reason that the Civil Service Association is a member of the Civil Service Federation and the ground was covered so fully and completely by Mr. Phelan that we desire in the first instance, to subscribe whole heartedly to the representations made by him.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Yes. We then can take it that outside of the particular matters which you will draw to our attention you endorse in toto the representation made by Mr. Phelan?—A. We do, sir. A number of matters relate chiefly to the services in Ottawa here, for the reason, as I say, that our membership is made up entirely of civil servants located in Ottawa.

In the first instance, the Civil Service Association is of the opinion that the scope of the reference of the Select Special Committee should be enlarged to include not only the Civil Service Act and regulations but also any and all matters pertaining to the Civil Service. We make the suggestion believing that this committee is competent to deal with any civil service questions not now within the scope of the order of reference, for example Civil Service Insurance, Superannuation, Health of Staff Organization, Appeal Boards, etc., which may be dealt with by any board or committee.

On the question of promotions I would like to say just a word or two on that. I might mention here that we take the liberty of stating a particular case, but it does set out rather definitely the position in so far as civil servants are concerned.

The subject of promotions is one of the greatest importance to the Service and we would ask, Mr. Chairman, whether the Association may be heard on this matter.

The situation which has arisen as a result of elimination of promotions during the past two years or so has been the cause of a great deal of worry and apprehension on the part of our members. When you consider that from July 31, 1932, to December 31, 1933, only 59 actual promotions have been made in a staff of well over 30,000 persons, there is real cause for worry. What we mean by 59 actual promotions is promotions carrying an increase in salary. During the same period 146 acting promotions were authorized by the Civil Service Commission, the persons promoted receiving no increased compensation. As a result many peculiar situations have arisen, such as the chief of staff having only honorary rank and no increased benefits in salary. Attention might be drawn to the case of an employee who has had two promotions since 1931, carrying with them in each case heavier responsibilities, and who is to-day in receipt of less salary than before this series of promotions were perpetrated upon him. I feel the word "perpetrated" is not an unkind word. While this may be an extreme case yet it serves to demonstrate another of the many anomalies in the Service at this time. The Association is strongly of the opinion that in order to protect the interest of the employee, and the general efficiency of the Service, it is essential that in all cases the regular procedure in connection with promotions should be carried out and the appointee definitely assigned to the higher position, even if the question of compensation has to remain in abeyance for the time being. If this procedure is not followed out there is apt to be a tendency to designate an employee to perform the duties of the position, resulting in such an employee so designated acquiring, although not regularly entitled to it, a stranglehold on the position to the detriment of the service as a whole, and in contravention of the merit system. We desire again to point out that the stoppage of promotions has not only an immediate effect in so far as salary is concerned, but in a great many cases will be reflected in the amount of superannuation which is based upon years of service, and average salary over a given period.

The Civil Service Association of Ottawa heartily concurs in the observations on this subject as contained in the 25th annual report of the Civil Service Commission.

The next item is one which has been dealt with by, I think, every representative appearing before this committee in so far as the Service is concerned. It is headed "*Re* Private Secretaries, Chapter 38, 19-20, George V, an Act to amend the Civil Service Act assented to June 14, 1929."

As in its presentation to the Select Committee in 1932 the Association wishes to again register a protest against the principle of the wholesale inclusion into the Service of private secretaries carrying with it the initial salary of \$3,120. As there are a very limited number of chief clerk positions in the Service it is quite apparent that the line of promotion is very definitely blocked, not only in the higher grades but the same blockage takes place all along the line. In the opinion of the Association there is nothing more demoralizing to a public servant than to find that after many years of service, having entered by competition and passing all necessary examinations, the position to which that servant so long aspired has been automatically closed to him. It is admitted at once that the persons in these secretarial positions are capable and efficient. The system, however, whereby they enter the Service without competitive examination, and with high ratings as Civil Service ratings go, thereby giving them a distinct advantage over the permanent Civil Servant, should in our opinion be discontinued.

May we, therefore, offer for the consideration of the Committee what the Association considers to be an entirely new idea with respect to the question of private secretaries.

We suggest that a permanent corps (secretariate) of private secretaries be created within the Service. The present staff of private secretaries to form the nucleus of such corps. The Act could then be amended to provide that in the event of a change of government, or the retirement of a Minister, that the incoming Ministry select their private secretaries from such corps or secretariate.

It is admitted, of course, that in some cases individual secretaries would not be satisfactory to certain Ministers, but our contention is that if a permanent corps were created a satisfactory secretary could be found for any Minister. This plan would eliminate the wholesale interjection into the Service of private secretaries no longer required owing to a change in government.

The Association believes that this Select Committee will appreciate the virtues of this suggestion, and that the adoption of this or a somewhat similar plan so that all private secretaries now in the Service be placed on a permanent basis, and continued in the Service in their present capacity as private secretary, would be the most satisfactory solution to this problem.

This question is of particular interest to the Civil Service Association for the reason that these positions and promotions refer to Ottawa only.

I think the present position is well known to the committee. Some of those persons are in positions not very pleasing to them; they are not in a position to do capable work.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that is the worst feature of it.

The WITNESS: Yes, and we think it is unfair to the men themselves and it is also unfair to the Service, and we think there should be some way of overcoming or overtaking a situation such as this.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. In setting up this group would the recommendation from your organization be that the Minister be compelled to select from that group until the number was exhausted?—A. I do not think so; we would hesitate to say that the Minister would be compelled, but we do think, after very careful consideration, that all the permanent staff should be employed in some capacity. If the Minister desires to bring in a personal or private secretary during his term of office, of course, there is nothing to prevent him from doing that, but we believe that men who are trained in that work, or trained in departmental work will be more useful than a man who is brought in for a year or for two or three years. These men must be trained in that particular work, and it is very difficult work.

Q. The mere setting up of a permanent corps would hardly solve the problem, would it? It would be a little difficult for a Minister to make a selection particularly if he came down perhaps at the tail end.—A. Well, if the present Act were abolished—

Q. Well, if it was abolished then your difficulties would be over, except that the secretary would be out of a job.—A. No, the suggestion here is that the men who are presently employed should form the nucleus, they should be continued in employment. We think that no hardship should be inflicted on any person who has given years of service up to this time.

Q. But supposing he was not employed, that comes back to the difficulty of the situation: supposing he were linked up with some permanent corps, supposing he was not re-employed?—A. Of course, if he were linked up to a permanent corps he would then be a permanent civil servant.

Q. What duties would he perform?—A. In that particular department or whatever department he would be assigned to.

Q. But that is the way it is at the present time, is it not?—A. No. On a change of government, of course, this Act takes care of men who are not required, or whose services are no longer required in that particular department, and they are assigned to duties elsewhere within the Service. Some of these men to-day are doing various jobs throughout the Service. In the event of this suggestion of the Association being workable, so to speak, we believe that that situation would be eliminated to a very great extent. We presume that certain Ministers would insist on bringing their own men in, but if the Act is a reasonable one and set up along these lines, we believe that many of these difficulties would be overcome, and we think it would be helpful to the Service. have not been worked out.

Q. But I don't just follow your suggestion. If you set up a permanent corps what would be the duties of this corps, those who were not taken into the Service again by the incoming Minister.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Is this what you have in mind, Mr. MacIsaac, that the Civil Service Commission would give a classification, as it were, and then examinations would be called and people already in the civil service could compete in that examination, but it does not necessarily imply that after the examination, even if they were successful, they would get the secretaryship, but if the Minister took his private secretary from those who did compete it would be desirable that he should do so?—A. Well, the idea as far as it has developed up to this time is that it would really be a matter of classification in so far as the present private secretaries are concerned, and that the incoming private secretaries, or the private secretaries who would be required in the event of a change of government should be selected from the present group of secretaries.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Mr. McIsaac, take the situation as it is to-day, every Minister has a private secretary. Supposing at the next election the present administration is defeated. Now then, all of these private secretaries would be left as it were in the air except those that might find their way into the Service because of the present law; but if your scheme were put into operation what would happen to those private secretaries? Would they be put into a corps called the secretarial group? What will be their function? Would they simply stand there and draw their salaries and do nothing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That is the point exactly, Mr. Chevrier.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Supposing there are 16 secretaries and the incoming Ministers retain 8 of them. That means 8 would be left without any work. As Mr. Laurin has just remarked to me they would be in No Man's Land. Would they be taken into the Service? If so, they would have to step over someone's head, or would they simply stand there and draw their salary and do no work?—A. I follow your question, Mr. Chevrier. I feel that is the situation at the present time but it would not be the position if this suggestion of the Association were carried out.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Just go back now, please. I think we are all in the same position, we do not just see what you have in mind when you are suggesting this permanent corps. Go a little more into detail and tell us what you have in mind.—A. Well, to suggest a permanent corps might be a misnomer. It would be really more of a classification, as suggested by Mr. MacInnis. A corps or classifica-

tion of this group would be different from what is recognized or understood in the Service as a pool, that is, where you have a group of persons in a pool, say stenographers.

Q. Yes, they have certain definite duties.—A. Yes, but in this case we think this suggestion should be worked out and would be effective.

Q. Wait now, don't get too far ahead. How is it going to be worked out?—A. Well, for example, take the Department of Pensions and National Health, there is at the present time a private secretary in that department. I presume that he would remain in that department, he would be prepared to stay in that department carrying out the duties under a new Minister, which he is called upon to do.

Q. Providing he is satisfactory to the new Minister?—A. Yes, and we believe that if that became law the Minister coming in, having a trained private secretary in the position, would be prepared to accept the services of a capable and competent man trained in that service for a number of years previously.

Q. Really what you are suggesting is that we make it compulsory for Ministers to take up private secretaries previously employed until they become exhausted, until the number becomes used up?—A. I do not think it is very far removed from the idea of the present Deputy Minister. A Deputy Minister comes in and serves under various Ministers. It is quite reasonable to assume that some of these gentlemen are not always agreeable to the new Minister on the first round, so to speak, and the Minister, if it were permissible by law to make the selection, would probably select his Deputy Minister, and assistant Deputy Minister, right down the line, but the law now happens to be that his deputy minister is there and it is not a selection by the incoming Minister. We believe that the same course of procedure in so far as the private secretary is concerned is workable. There are many details in connection with it that that have not been worked out.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. How many were concerned four years ago when the government changed, who were transferred to some department or other?—A. We think about 16 or 17.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: They were not taken on in a secretarial capacity by the new Minister.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Oh no, some were retained.

The WITNESS: Yes, some were retained. We have a number of cases in the service where one private secretary has been carried on from one Minister to another. We believe the idea is workable; we believe it is worth while, and that men now acting in the capacity of private secretaries would not be placed in an embarrassing position as a number of ex-private secretaries happen to find themselves to-day.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Do you know what the procedure is in Great Britain?—A. I cannot explain it, Mr. MacInnis. This question is of particular interest to the Civil Service Association for the reason that these men are placed in positions in Ottawa, and practically the entire membership of our Association is centred in Ottawa.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There is no doubt it cuts in.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Oh yes.

Mr. LAURIN: There are only 5 or 6 over 5 or 10 or 20 years.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. In respect of what Mr. Laurin remarks, do you know how many had to be absorbed into the Service, not in the capacity of private secretaries but in other positions as a result of the change in 1932?—A. We can supply those figures, Mr. Chairman. I have not got that information now.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do you know, Mr. Bland?

Mr. BLAND: 12 I think, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That went into the service?

The WITNESS: 17, it was stated in 1932.

Mr. LAURIN: They kept 5 or 7.

The WITNESS: I think 17 was the figure given at that time.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. 17 that were absorbed into the Service?—A. That had to be dealt with in one way or another.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That is not the point. Some of these private secretaries did remain in that capacity with the incoming Minister?—A. That is true.

Q. Now I am talking about the ones who were not but who were absorbed in other positions in the service.—A. I have not got the exact figures, but I will get that for you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bland mentioned 12.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: All right.

The WITNESS: Appeal Boards is the next item. The Association is pleased to note that this committee seems favourably disposed towards the setting up of a permanent appeal board. It is felt that with the setting up of a board or body of this character many of the very difficult problems which have been submitted to this committee from time to time could be dealt with and decided in a satisfactory manner.

There is one other matter which I desire to bring to the attention of this committee, that is, the position of a number of ex-Interior employees who were let out of the Service. The Civil Service Association has great sympathy with the former members of the Department of the Interior, many of whom are still in the prime of life, whilst others are just beyond the age when they could successfully enter the industrial field, but who were released from the Service although capable of many more years in their chosen work. It is felt, therefore, that the recommendations contained in the order in council P.C. 180/1118 of May 15, 1931, should not be lost sight of, and that any additional staff required consequent upon increasing governmental activities be drawn from this group of trained former employees. The re-engagement of these persons would serve a double purpose, that is, re-establishment of the individual and at the same time afford some measure of relief to the heavy strain placed upon the Superannuation Fund by reason of such unexpected retirements.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. That is, that they be absorbed in the other departments as they may be required.—A. Yes. It is not necessary, I presume, to read the order in council.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No.

The WITNESS: That, Mr. Chairman, constitutes my submission this afternoon. I should like to add at this time that the first vice-president of the Association, Miss Edna Ingles, is here and will make representations in connection

with superannuation and other matters. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the courtesy extended to me this afternoon by yourself and the other members of the committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McIsaac.

Witness retired.

EDNA L. INGLIS called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Whom do you represent, Miss Inglis?—A. I am first vice-president of the Civil Service Association of Ottawa of which Mr. McIsaac is the president. There were some particular points that the Association wanted me to deal with.

The first one is a difficulty that has arisen in connection with the Craftsmen employed at the Mint. When the British Mint was taken over and brought under Canadian jurisdiction the Act clearly intended that all of these people were to be transferred into permanent positions. The action, however, only resulted in 20 established and 40 unestablished employees being classed as temporary so far as the Canadian Civil Service is concerned.

The control of the Royal Canadian Mint was transferred from the British Civil Service to the Canadian Civil Service on December 1st, 1931, as a branch of the Department of Finance. At that time, or shortly afterwards, the Civil Service Commission classified the staff as taken over, assigned the positions under the Civil Service Act to all members of that staff down to the Mint Craftsmen, Grade 3, but postponed for twelve months consideration of the positions to be held by those below that branch. There is a minute of the Treasury Board recording this matter. The conditions of the transfer were explained in a letter to each member of the staff dated 27th October, 1931, from the Deputy Master and Comptroller of the Royal Mint, London.

You understand, that these 20 men were in established positions prior to the transfer and considered that they had every right to be placed in permanent positions when the transfer was effected. I may say that in the order in council authorizing the classification this statement was made:—

Under Section 9 of the Civil Service Act, the Civil Service Commission recommends that the following establishment of positions be authorized for the Royal Canadian Mint; that for a period of one year or until such time as a definite estimate of the number of workman employees that will be required on the permanent establishment can be determined, positions of Mint Craftsman, Grade 1, Mint Craftsman, Grade 2, and Apprentice Craftsman be established on a temporary basis only.

It is on the authority of that order in council that these men were left in a temporary situation.

Q. 20 in all?—A. 20 in all in established positions but there were 40 others. It covers 60. The total complement of the Mint altogether in Canada is 86, 80 at Ottawa and 6 at Vancouver.

On the 13th December, 1932, a letter was submitted to the Minister of Finance from the employees "for approval that the Civil Service Commission be asked to proceed with the completion of the classification of the staff of the former Ottawa Branch Mint as on the 30th November, 1931. There are two classes to be considered; first, those who were on the original establishment, being thus under the Act, Chapter 48 of 1931, entitled to retain their privileges under the Imperial Superannuation Acts; and second, unestablished men who were permanent employees, but only entitled to a gratuity on retirement in certain circumstances. After 12 months' experience of working under the new

constitution it is considered that all the men in the established class should certainly be brought under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and further, that the remaining permanent but unestablished employees are entitled to the same privilege. It is further submitted that, should the Civil Service Commission decide in favour of admitting one or both of these classes, that those so admitted should have extended to them the option, given under the Act, of coming under the Civil Service Superannuation Act."

My own impression is, that if they were made permanent they automatically would have the option of coming under our Superannuation Act. The letter continues:

It is understood that the inclusion of the classes now sought to be brought under the Civil Service Act was recommended by the Commission, but that they were, at the request of the Department of Finance, excluded from permanent status by P.C. 5/323 of the 13th February, 1932, the department at that time not being satisfied as to the necessity for this larger permanent staff. At the date of transference the working staff was at a minimum and the clerical and supervising staff below normal strength, and 12 months' experience has shown that the positions now brought under notice, all filled by men of long training in the Mint, should be given the permanent status to which, it is submitted, the holders have an equitable claim under the privileges of the Act establishing the Royal Canadian Mint.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Has the original number of employees been reduced in the last year?—
A. No, not at all.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. What is the average service?—A. 23·6 years; they have had long service. I have a statement here which I will file, if I may.

7th April, 1934.

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF ESTABLISHED CRAFTSMEN

Service to 1st January, 1934

Craftsmen appointed to the Mint in 1908	12 men,	26	year's	service	each
" " " " 1909	2 "	25	"	"	"
" " " " 1913	2 "	21	"	"	"
" " " " 1914	1 man	20	"	"	"
" " " " 1916	2 men	18	"	"	"
" " " " 1922	1 man	12	"	"	"
<hr/>					
20					
<hr/>					
Total combined service	472	years			
Average service per man	23·6	years			

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Have any new employees been taken on since the Mint has been taken over by the Canadian government?—A. I cannot tell you definitely, but I am under the impression that there are a few new ones. In addition to those 20 there are also 40 temporary employees.

In respect to the memorandum the following was received from the Deputy Minister of Finance.—

On July 18th last, the Treasury Board issued a regulation that permanent appointments were to be restricted to instances where the duties of the position cannot be performed efficiently on a temporary basis. In

view of this restriction, which applied to the whole Public Service, it would be difficult to recommend permanent appointments in the Mint. It would seem to be advisable to defer this question until such time as the regulation referred to above has been rescinded or amended.

These people in the Mint, of course, think that was no reply; that it did not answer their question and that the situation that gave rise to a ruling like that should not have been allowed to affect their cases.

Of course, they are affected so far as superannuation is concerned. The staff were given the option of remaining under the British Superannuation Act or of coming under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1924. In the event of the latter, service is allowed only to the extent of one half in computing all allowances. More favourable treatment was requested in a letter dated 20th February, 1932, from the Master of the Mint to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, but no action has been taken.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. If they exercised that option to which you have referred, what would happen to their rights under the Imperial Superannuation?—A. It applies, of course, to the individual case. Each individual would have the right to elect. If he comes under the Canadian Superannuation Act he would drop his rights under the British scheme, he cannot have both.

Q. He would lose all rights which he had under the Imperial Act?—A. Yes.

Q. And all moneys deposited?—A. Well, of course, the British scheme is not contributory. There are a few of the employees at the Mint who were put in what they called established positions; a scheme was instituted in 1923 whereby these men were allowed to come into the British scheme of superannuation and a small deduction was made from their salaries. I would say, it worked out this way. As the British superannuation is considered rather in the way of deferred salary payments, and they were drawing higher wages than they would have if they had been under the Superannuation Act, a slight deduction was made. Of course, that has been wiped out with those who were brought in. Many of these men are anxious to come under the Canadian Act and be made permanent so that they will have the option of coming under the Superannuation Act.

Q. The objection that was raised by the Soldier Settlement Board about its people lacking permanency cannot apply to the Mint because surely we are going to keep on coining money until Kingdom come?—A. The claim these men make is that never since this action was taken has there been a diminution of the work at all.

Q. It is absolutely permanent?—A. It is permanent work.

Q. We cannot go without money.—A. A point is made that it is only reasonable that these men should become extremely discontented and no matter what the motive may be which has prompted the Treasury Board to exclude these men from their just and equitable claim to permanent status, it has an extremely detrimental effect upon the high standard of efficiency of which the Mint is proud to boast. These men have desired me to stress the point with regard to their expert knowledge, which, of course, is borne out by that statement of service. They have spent the best part of their lives in the Mint and the knowledge gained therein is absolutely of no use in any other sphere of activity, a fact which penalizes them should they be compelled to seek positions elsewhere. It is true that the Mint suffers slack periods, which is only natural in an institution of such an unique character, but on the other hand, the Mint also has extremely busy periods, to such an extent that overtime has been resorted on on many occasions.

Q. Do you not think, Miss Inglis, it is rather a matter of adjustment on a fair and equitable basis as between the department and those interested?—A. Yes I do, Mr. Bowman, and that is really why it has been brought to the

attention of the Association because they have not been able to get satisfaction through the department. It really is a departmental matter. It is a matter of having a permanent appropriation of the amount, specified as a permanent appropriation to cover those men. As it is, they are paid out of temporary salaries.

Q. I was referring, of course, to the matter of superannuation. I can quite understand your representation to us with regard to those men becoming permanent. That is a matter that perhaps properly comes before us.—A. Yes. These men also claim that any of their number who elect to transfer from the British to the Canadian Superannuation Act should have special consideration with respect to their service for which no payments have been made into the Canadian Superannuation Fund. They claim that as the British Superannuation Retiring Allowances are considered to be in the nature of deferred salary payments they should be given the benefits of these amounts upon transfer to the Canadian scheme; that is, the value should be applied in such a way as to permit these employees to count all their service in calculating their superannuation allowances without their requiring to make contributions.

As the matter stands at present the full time may be counted if contributions are made for the full time; otherwise, if no contributions are made only half the service can be counted. As the service of these men is lengthy, varying from 12 to 26 years, payments of 5 per cent of salary with 4 per cent interest would be prohibitive.

Another matter that the Association has asked me to deal with, was to stress certain points in connection with superannuation. As the president has stated, the Association, of course, endorses the recommendations and evidence that were given by Mr. Phelan, the president of the Federation.

When the Superannuation Act was passed in July, 1924, it was recognized by the service generally and more particularly by those officers of the Civil Service Association who had for a long time been urging on the Government the necessity for some superannuation scheme, that the Act had some serious defects. However, hopes ran high that as these became more apparent with the administration of the Act, amending legislation would be enacted to correct them.

The Act has been in force almost ten years and little has been accomplished in this respect. It may be suggested that ten years is not a long period in which to test out legislation of this nature. Be that as it may the time has been sufficient to demonstrate the use of the measure and also the degree to which it is ineffective.

In 1926 the Association along with other organizations with which it is affiliated, presented to the Prime Minister a list of Amendments considered necessary to make the Act as equitable and effective in application as possible. Some headway has been made. Certain changes were made to the Act by amendments passed in 1927. Further minor difficulties have been removed through rulings of the Law Officers of the Crown, and other adjustments have been made by means of regulations approved by the Governor in Council under Section 11 of the Act. However, no amendment of major importance has been enacted and it is submitted that amendments are very necessary to render the Act as effective as it should be as an instrument in producing more scientific administration of the Civil Service.

The amendments sponsored by the Association fall into three divisions. First come the proposals relating to the extension of the right to come under the Act to certain classes not now under its provisions. This would include the following:—

The extension of the right to elect to come under the Act to those eligible who failed to do so previously for a period of one year;

The extension of the benefits of the Act to regular employees on "prevailing rates;"

The extension of benefits of the Act to long term temporaries.

Secondly is the group of proposed amendments regarding the computation of past services. These include:—

The remission of four per cent interest now charged on the payment of arrears of contributions;

The computing of contributory service on the first thirty-five years of service, rather than on the last thirty-five years;

The right to make payment for a part of non-contributory service, where the employee is not in a position to pay for all of it;

The conditions which all three in this group are framed to correct have had a deterring influence on election to come under the Act of those employees whose cases were adversely affected thereby.

The desirability of the inclusion of other kinds of public service in calculating benefits is responsible for two proposed amendments. One makes provision for the allowance of service in the Great War as service under the Act in all cases; and the other for the allowance of service in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, preceding civil service, as service under the Act.

The third group relates more specifically to benefits and probably has the greatest significance to all contributors to the fund. It is suggested that the Act should be so amended that each contributor or his or her estate, shall receive back in the event of retirement, dismissal or death, not less than the amount contributed without interest. This proposed amendment has come to be known as "the minimum return of contributions." The other two amendments in this group refer to retirement optional with the employee after thirty-five years' service, regardless of age: and "average salary" to be based on the last three years of service in all cases.

ANOTHER CHANCE TO ELECT AND EXTENSION OF APPLICATION

With the lapse of time certain amendments have become of greater importance than others to the Service generally. It is therefore desired to stress the amendments of greatest urgency at present. Conditions have changed considerably in the last ten years and nearly 5,000 permanent employees remaining in the Service who failed to elect to come under the Act from 1924 to 1927 would do so now if given the opportunity. While these employees may have made a mistake in judgment, and were badly advised, the fact that the rate of interest on the Retirement Fund has been lowered from 5 per cent to 4 per cent, so producing a situation different from that obtaining when they elected to remain under the Retirement Fund, is a matter to be taken into consideration at the present time and it is felt these employees should be given another opportunity to elect.

It will be recalled that since January, 1920, 5 per cent compounded half yearly was credited to each person's account in the Retirement Fund. There was no reason to suppose this would be lowered and when these employees elected between 1924 and 1927 to remain under the Retirement Fund, they believed the conditions surrounding the Fund at that time would remain practically the same. In July last year, by Order in Council, the rate of interest was lowered and in view of these changed circumstances it is submitted these same employees should be given an opportunity now of transferring to superannuation.

Another group to be affected by a new opportunity to elect to go under Superannuation, are the so-called long term temporaries. If legislation is enacted this session to make them permanent those who are eligible will automatically come under superannuation, but if this fails of accomplishment this session it

would be advantageous for them to be given a chance to elect now. Incidentally it may be pointed out that if these employees were under superannuation, those who are reaching the retirement age could be separated from the service with less hardship.

PREVAILING RATES

In asking that the Act be extended to "prevailing rates" employees it should be pointed out that the designation of their kind of service arises more from the method of arriving at a fair remuneration for their services than is truly descriptive of their rates of pay. Practically all the arguments which in the first place could be advanced for a superannuation Act for the Service at large, can be used in their behalf.

As the Act reads at present and as interpreted by the Law Officers of the Crown, certain classes of employees paid "prevailing rates" and not "a stated annual salary" are excluded from its provisions. These employees are mostly in the departments of Public Works, Public Printing and Stationery, Mines, Marine, Fisheries, National Defence and Railways and Canals. While paid at prevailing rates on an hourly, daily, weekly or monthly basis, they are employed continuously from year and practically are permanent, some of them having over thirty-five years continuous service and many having upwards of fifteen years. The same factors that were taken into consideration in applying a superannuation scheme in the Service generally apply in like manner to this class of employee. This was recognized by the Government when the "Calder Act" was being administered and an amendment was passed to cover prevailing rates employees. The Association is of the opinion that these employees should be brought under the Act by amending legislation and venture to express the hope that this Committee will so recommend.

COMPUTATION OF SERVICE

In computing service to be counted for calculating allowances some difficulties have been ironed out. Under certain conditions all past service where the emolument was derived directly from the Crown may be included. This means that even if the early service was paid for by an hourly, daily, weekly, monthly or yearly rate if the necessary contributions are made, it may be counted in whole or if no contributions are made, half the period may be counted. However, the Civil Service Superannuation Act has lagged behind other legislation embracing the principle of including all service under the Crown for pension purposes as embodied in the Militia Pension Act as amended to date, and in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act. In calculating pension for these services, both these Acts provide for counting service under the Civil Service Retirement and Superannuation Act and in the latter Act, service also under the Civil Service Superannuation Act is counted. It seems only fair that reciprocal treatment should apply to those persons now in the Civil Service who were formerly in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. If this were made to apply at once it is estimated that only about eighty or ninety persons would be affected. However the number has little to do with it as the principle is the important matter.

Mr. CHEVRIER: That is the idea. principle counts. I am not concerned about the cost, I am concerned about the principle.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the tax payer might be concerned about the matter of cost.

Mr. CHEVRIER: It does not affect them at all.

The WITNESS: It is not appreciable.

than no bread. Yet the fact remains that the prohibition against promotions works greatly to their disadvantage, frequently resulting in their having to perform duties of higher grade positions without receiving either recognition or remuneration commensurate with the work. Especially do the Grade 3 Stenographers feel there should be a grade 4 Stenographic position added to the classification. In normal times the practice is to deal with exceptional cases by reclassifying them as Clerk, Grade 4. The claim is made that this procedure curtails legitimate promotions; i.e., a dead line is reached. The adding of the fourth grade to this range of position would permit of special recognition being given to those stenographers who do bilingual, special or technical work.

It should be pointed out that many women in the service who are working in the second and third grades in the stenographic and clerical classes are qualified to do much higher work. Many of them have university degrees yet in order to enter the service had to do so by the second grade in these classes. With their qualifications opportunity should be afforded them to progress to more responsible work with commensurate salaries.

In only a comparatively few cases have women been rewarded for meritorious service by promotion to administrative and executive posts. We have in the service to-day lamentably few women occupying worth while posts. There are a few chief clerks—five in number, but these were Private Secretaries drafted in to the legitimate service by the amendment to the Civil Service Act of 1928.

In addition to these five chief clerks we have seven head clerks, one chief actuarial assistant, a few assistant chemists, one assistant Invertebrate Palaeontologist, 39 principal clerks, one senior translator, one translator, some library assistants, some departmental librarians, a few secretaries to executives, and then the other positions occupied by the women are Grades 1 to 3, in the clerical and stenographic positions.

The few higher grade positions filled by women in the Canadian Civil Service are in strong contrast with the opportunities afforded women in the United States where women are employed in many administrative, executive and technical positions. I think it has been particularly noticeable lately, that there has been a tendency on the part of the administration in the United States to appoint women to high administrative and executive offices. I might state that a woman was appointed to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CHEVRIER: And a woman was appointed as Ambassador to Denmark.

The WITNESS: Yes, a woman was appointed as Ambassador to Denmark, but in the American service they appoint a great many women to these higher positions. In their annual report for 1932 they say:

In the professional and scientific service women received a considerable number of appointments to the higher salaried positions, such as senior social economist, senior economist, and senior educationalist, all at \$4,600 a year; educationalist (special in western European school systems), at \$3,800; associate supervisor (Home Economics), associate bacteriologist (medical), associate aquatic biologist, associate geologist (for research in sedimentary projects), associate social economist, associate industrial economist, and demonstration teacher, all at \$3,200; and head of Home Economics and associate in public information, at \$2,900.

Other positions of a professional or scientific character to which women were appointed include associate home economist, assistant economist, assistant industrial economist, assistant agricultural economist, and so on, there is a long list.

Then in the British Civil Service for some little time now women have been admitted to the higher positions, and there is a movement afoot to open all positions in the civil service of Great Britain to British women. There is a com-

mittee at present reporting on the advisability or rather studying the advisability of opening the Consular posts to British women. I think probably this point is one that appears rather amusing to us because in England they segregate the sexes in the service; men and women do not work in the same rooms.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Why not?—A. Well, that would be my question too, Mr. Laurin, but they seem to think that they are making a very great step in the right direction, shall I say, to classify them together in the same branches.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. They at least have that advantage here in Canada?—A. Yes, we have more advantages, Mr. Chairman.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Has not a committee in Great Britain reported or recommended equality for women in the civil service? There was a discrimination actually in the Civil Service Act against women, but I think a committee has recommended recently the removal of that.—A. Oh yes. Many of the positions in the British Civil Service have been closed to women. I have a clipping from the Times of March 27th covering that. You will remember that the Royal Commission functioned in 1929-1931 and it brought in that recommendation, and then the Whitley Council have been dealing with it, and now the report has been made that all this discrimination should be removed against women. And they even go so far there as to make provision for the retention of women after marriage. Up to the present there has been what they call the marriage bar just as we have it here; women were required to resign their position on marriage, and now they are making a recommendation that they should be retained, and they go so far now as to make a recommendation in connection with maternity leave with the idea that married women be retained in the service.

CLASSIFICATION

It is claimed that in some instances the women carry heavy enough responsibilities but receive recognition neither in status nor salary. This might be termed a grievance of long standing; to a certain extent dating back to the time in 1919 when the Classification was applied to the personnel of the Service. At least the women feel that while the *modus operandi* was to classify a position without reference to the occupant of that position, an eye was always cast on the occupant and if a woman, the classification was lower than if the occupant were a man. This may have been responsible for the low classification of the Library Services. These positions are filled by women mostly. Reference was made to the low classification of this branch of work two years ago.

Reference was made particularly in our statement two years ago to the low classification of this branch of the service, and I was very pleased to see that the committee is going to hear Miss Grace Hart, one of the librarians on this particular matter of the classification of the librarians throughout the Service.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I really do not know whether it is a matter we have any jurisdiction over.

The WITNESS: Well, do you think, Mr. Chairman, that if this committee makes a recommendation in that connection it would not have considerable weight with the powers that have to deal with it?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I know, but really we should not make recommendations on matters for which there is no reference to us.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I think we should hear Miss Hart.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am not objecting to hearing Miss Hart at all.

The WITNESS: I now come to the question of Service Councils or Appeal Board.

It is because of the fact that their difficulties are largely a matter of administration that the women of the Service are in favour of Service Councils or some form of Appeal Board. They are willing to have their cases argued before a representative body and they think if a Board were established, it would result in their receiving fairer treatment. In Councils they would have a chance of stating their difficulties, which is the initial and probably the most important step in having them corrected. The women are willing to stand or fall by merit, and at all times are prepared to submit their difficulties to a Council at which they would have representation.

That brings me to speak of the attitude I noticed in the committee a few days ago, in connection with an Appeal Board. We naturally would be very glad to see a permanent board set up of as small a size as possible. I think, Mr. Bowman, it was yourself who suggested that it might be comprised of about 3 people. It would be of very great advantage to have a small board. There would be an advantage in having a permanent board; there would be continuity of service there, and consequently experience and knowledge, and there would be accumulative training so that after a period of time the board decisions would have particular weight.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It would really act as a sort of meeting ground to thresh out differences in a friendly, amicable spirit.

The WITNESS: It seems to us that if a small board were set up that many of the points that have come before this committee, for instance, might very well be dealt with, although not by any means all of the points. Nothing could have taken the place of this committee naturally, but as we go on from time to time and have a recurrence of anomalies arising in the service largely in the matter of administration these could be ironed out. You can see that in most cases the points that have been brought up before this committee have been points where an endeavour has been made by the individual, sometimes by the groups in a department, and also by the organizations to bring matters before the powers that be but without having any very great satisfaction. We do think that if we had a permanent appeal board that situation could be greatly improved.

There was another point in connection with some recommendations that have been made on behalf of the women previously in connection with the conditions under which persons in the service work.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I remember those particularly. Your representations will be on the grounds of the previous year?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think most of the members of the committee remember those. ✓

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Has there been any improvement effected since then?—A. Not very much, Mr. MacInnis. Of course, the offices are not quite as crowded, and I would say that as new departmental buildings are built conditions will be better; they are bound to be better.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Some of the old buildings are pretty bad.

The WITNESS: They are lamentably lacking in the proper facilities.

Two years ago this committee made a recommendation in connection with retiring leave. It will be recalled that one item of the report recommended that

retiring leave should be dealt with as a matter of gratuity to permit the filling of a permanent position as soon as the person severed his connection with the position. Then you will remember that was implemented by an amendment to the Civil Service Act. Nothing has been done yet in connection with that because I presume they think the time is not opportune. However, we think now is a good time to do it for the reason that when these positions fall vacant and are not being filled would be a good time to start paying the gratuity at once; there would not be any double payments.

Another thing, we do think that the retiring leave should be divorced from any other form of leave in the service. As you probably know, amendments to the leave regulations were made recently, the beginning of this fiscal year, to be enforced for a year. Naturally the organizations are watching the developments very closely, but the only recommendation we have to make at present is that retiring leave should be divorced from any other form of leave.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that covers everything.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, that is a very fine culmination to many clear statements that have been presented to us to-day. Thank you very much, Miss Inglis.

WOMEN UNDER SUPERANNUATION MARCH 31, 1931

Total women	4,475
Women who elected	2,367
Women automatically under superannuation	2,108
No previous service	801
One to nine years' service	2,484
Ten years' service and over	1,190
Total	4,475
Under no fund	131
Under Superannuation Fund No. 1	4
Under Superannuation Fund No. 2
Under Retirement Fund	1,676
Under Superannuation Fund No. 3	556
Total	2,367

A POSSIBLE APPEAL BOARD

"In the evidence submitted by the Federation and the Association before the Special Parliamentary Committee in 1932, the question of Appeal Boards was gone into exhaustively and on pages 237, 254, 256, and 264 of the evidence the details concerning the recommendations are to be found. Lately with the trend of Civil Service affairs being as it is, the opinion amongst civil servants is crystallizing in the idea that the most satisfactory method of dealing with the difficulty, which an Appeal Board might be created to meet, would be to have a permanent Appeal Board.

The reason for suggesting permanency for this Board is quite evident. If temporary Boards were created to deal with specific cases such as those that might come up in one department where the Board might consist of a representative from the Department, a representative from the Civil Service Commission and the organization to which the employee or employees belong, the result would be that after dealing with a specific point, the Board would practically dissolve and that same Board would not be required until another point of somewhat similar nature in the same department would come up for consideration. If a permanent Board were established, its training would be cumulative and in no instance would its judgment in making a decision be curtailed by the fact that it had not had experience of dealing with matters affecting different Departments and also involving principles of administration and application of legislation throughout the whole Service. Furthermore the benefit of having trained opinions on these matters which would develop as a result of a permanent Board would

be of increasing value to the Public Service. After functioning for some time there would be developed a comprehensive national outlook in the administration of Civil Service affairs.

It is the submission of the Civil Service Association of Ottawa that a Permanent Appeal Board for the Civil Service would be more efficient and much to be preferred to Ad Hoc Boards. To facilitate the despatch of business a Board of three members, one of whom would represent the Civil Service, is suggested. A Permanent Board would conserve the experience gained on cases already heard and thus bring to bear on further cases the knowledge of a wide survey as well as a familiarity with precedents which necessarily would be involved. For the prompt despatch of business a small Board as suggested would be highly desirable. As such a Board proved its worth it would earn the respect of Parliament, the Government, the Civil Service Commission and the Civil Service itself.

The functions of the Board would revolve chiefly around enquiry into the facts of cases where disagreement exists between employees, either individually or collectively, and departments, upon the application of legislation, Orders in Council and other regulations fixing the conditions of employment in the Civil Service. The Board could hear witnesses, in certain cases could examine documents, and while avoiding the more formal functions of a court of law, would necessarily proceed in a quasi-judicial manner. It would be proposed that only matters which had failed of settlement through the ordinary channels should be brought before the Board, and in any event the Board should exercise discretion in order to eliminate cases not properly the subject of appeal.

The Board, assuming that it function in the expected manner, would not only straighten out many difficulties now outstanding for some considerable time, which have arisen in connection with the administration of existing regulations (many of which are never aired as matters now stand), but would deal with future similar cases and in the final result should create a feeling of greater satisfaction throughout the Service in the equity of departmental administration of regulations. The chief value of the Board would lie in the fact that it would function as an impartial fact finding body, recommending solutions of difficulties, and in advancing this proposal, although representation of the Civil Service thereon is held to be important, in no event is it suggested that any member of the Board should view matters in an *ex parte* manner."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are going to try to clean up our evidence at the next sitting of the committee, and if any other civil service organizations, or anybody else want to make representations to the committee they should try to do so next Wednesday.

The committee adjourned at 6.15 p.m. to resume on Wednesday, June 6th, at 11 a.m.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 10

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 1934

WITNESSES:

D. M. Kennedy, M.P.
Fred Jacques
Alex. Stewart
J. A. R. Paquin
Miss Grace Hart

APPENDIX

Supplementary memoranda filed by:

Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L.
Civil Service Federation of Canada.
Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada.

OTTAWA
J. O. PATENAUDE
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1934

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

WEDNESDAY, June 6, 1934.

The meeting came to order at 11 a.m., Mr. Bowman, acting chairman, presiding.

Members present, Messrs. Bowman, Laurin, MacInnis and Chevrier.

Mr. Fred Jacques appeared on behalf of certain ex-employees of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. D. M. Kennedy, M.P., appeared on behalf of the House of Commons sessional employees.

Mr. Alex. Stewart appeared on behalf of the foremen and assistant foremen of the Public Works department.

Mr. J. A. R. Paquin appeared and made representations on behalf of the Ottawa Elevators Branch of the C.S. Federation.

Miss Grace Hart submitted representations on behalf of the librarians in the government service.

Communications from the following were filed for consideration:

J. P. Duggan, Secretary Treasurer, Royal Northwest Mounted Police Veterans Association.

W. K. Elsing, M.P., enclosing a brief on behalf of the employees of the Soldier Settlement Board in British Columbia.

Thomas Doran, President, International Accountants and Executives' Corporation in Canada.

Charles D. Griffith, Dominion Secretary, Canadian Postmasters' Association, with attached correspondence.

W. H. Jackson to the Hon. Charles Stewart, M.P., respecting leave regulations as affecting employees at the Edmonton post office.

I. D. Cotnam, M.P., respecting the Pembroke post office.

W. N. Duncan, National Secretary, United Postal Employees.

Supplementary memorandum re Disability Preference under Civil Service Act was filed by J. R. Bowler, General Secretary, Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L. (Printed in Appendix hereto.)

Supplementary memorandum of the Civil Service Federation of Canada. (Printed in Appendix hereto.)

Supplementary memorandum submitted by the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada. (Printed in Appendix hereto.)

The meeting adjourned at the call of the chair.

A. A. FRASER,

Clerk.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

June 6, 1934.

The select special committee on Civil Service Act, met at 11 a.m., Mr. Bowman, Acting Chairman.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I move that Mr. Bowman take the chair.

Agreed.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY, M.P. (*Peace River*), appeared and addressed the meeting.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I have come to present to you some facts regarding the employees of the House of Commons. I have not been appointed or delegated by any person or body to appear before you, but, as a Member of Parliament, I have come in contact with certain problems that I think this committee should consider. As Members we are, in a sense, the employers of the Staff of the House of Commons.

There is some difference of opinion, I believe, as to whether the sessional employees should be classed as temporary or permanent. This should be cleared up. I think that all employees, in all branches of the House of Commons—stenographers, guards, protective staff, messengers and others, where the work is of a permanent character, that is, work that is part of the business of the session and has to be carried on every session, should be permanent; at least, after a reasonable test as to their fitness for the work. I think one session should be regarded as a reasonable time of probation.

I wish to point out that, under present conditions, or even normal conditions, it is unreasonable to expect employees generally, of the House of Commons, to supplement their earnings to any extent during the recess.

The sessions vary in length and are opened at no fixed period, nor prorogued at any given time. No one can tell when a session will begin or when it will end. Take the last ten years' sessions—these began on different dates. Here are a few examples: In 1926—December 9; in 1930—September 8; in 1932—October 6. Prorogation took place as early as April 14 in 1927, and as late as August 31 in 1931. Then, there are varying adjournments, some I may say with pay and some without pay: In 1927—13 days; in 1926-27—54 days; in the session of 1932-33, from November 25, 1932, to January 30, 1933—66 days. The session of 1932-33 was a six months' session spread over eight months of the year. I am attaching a statement from the Canada Year Book 1933, which gives the duration and date of opening of each session since 1922.

Under these conditions, it is quite impossible for an employee of the House of Commons to be able, even under normal conditions, to depend on supplementing the salary received from the House of Commons in any reasonable way. That is generally speaking. There are exceptions, of course.

Sessions have varied in length during the last ten years from one hundred days to 177 days.

The wages of these employees vary from \$4 to \$5 per day. Their earnings for a session, therefore, vary from \$400 to \$800 with an average of about \$600. I submit this is not a decent wage or salary for employees of the House of Commons.

The House of Commons is the chief legislative body of this Dominion. It regulates by law, trade and commerce, fair trade practices, and, in some cases, fair wages. I submit that where we have experienced men and women earning \$600 under such conditions, we have not fair wage conditions in this House of Commons. We should have without any question. The Government and the Members of Parliament should be model employers. Industry should be given an example as well as regulatory laws.

I think it is fair to say that the work of the House of Commons is equally as important as that of the departments. I think that similar work in the House of Commons should be compensated equally as well as that of the departments. Take stenographers for example, and I do not think the departmental stenographers are overpaid, or that their conditions are unduly favourable: Grade 1 salaries range from \$720 per annum to \$1,020. Grade 2, and I believe this is the grade with which a large number of the House of Commons stenographers compare, the salaries range from \$1,080 to \$1,380 per annum. Grade 2, law stenographers—\$1,140 to \$1,440 per annum. Some of the stenographers of the House of Commons do, undoubtedly, qualify in skill and efficiency with that required for Grade 3, where the salaries range from \$1,380 to \$1,680.

The departmental employee gets leave of absence with pay for a period not exceeding 18 days, excluding Sundays, in any one fiscal year. Then, also, there is provision for leave of absence, with pay, in case of sickness.

The hours in the departments are from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. They also have superannuation benefits.

I want to make it clear that I am not against any of these provisions, but I do submit that the House of Commons employees, engaged in similar work, are entitled to similar treatment. They work from nine to six, and on Saturdays from nine till one. In addition, they are required to work overtime from 7.30 to 10 p.m. or later, or from two to six on Saturdays once in every two weeks, besides working overtime, if necessary, to keep up with ordinary work. I note the following statement was made by the Clerk of the House before this committee on April 13, 1932:—

Our people work day and night during session. True, they may have a long recess—although not as long as people think. If you consider they have to work morning, afternoon and evening, during the session of 125 days and their work increases a few weeks sometimes before and after the session, if you figure this out they do, of course, put in more working hours in the year than the ordinary civil servant who works only during statutory hours in the departments.

While this general statement may not apply to all the sessional employees to which I refer, it does point to the fact that the comparison between the departments and the House of Commons is not a case of five or six months against eleven months.

There is no doubt in my mind that these employees are entitled to permanence, salary, and conditions comparable to that enjoyed by departmental employees. This would be an encouragement and promote a higher standard of efficiency.

STATEMENT FROM THE CANADA YEAR BOOK 1933, SHOWING THE DURATION AND SESSIONS OF DOMINION PARLIAMENT FOR THE YEARS 1922 TO 1932

(Page 76—Duration and Sessions of Dominion Parliaments, 1867-1932.)

Number of Parliament	Session	Date of Opening	Date of Prorogation	Days of Session	Elections, Writs Returnable, Dissolutions and Length of Parliaments
14th Parliament.....	1st	Mar. 8, 1922..	June 28, 1922..	113	Dec. 6, 1921 ⁽³⁾
	2nd	Jan. 31, 1923..	June 30, 1923..	151	Jan. 14, 1922 ⁽⁴⁾
	3rd	Feb. 28, 1924..	July 19, 1924..	143	Sept. 5, 1925 ⁽⁵⁾
	4th	Feb. 5, 1925..	June 27, 1925..	143	3 y., 7 m. 26d. ⁽⁶⁾
15th Parliament.....	1st	Jan. 7, 1926..	July 2, 1926..	177 ⁽¹⁾	Oct. 29, 1925 ⁽³⁾
					Dec. 7, 1925 ⁽⁴⁾
16th Parliament.....	1st	Dec. 9, 1926..	April 14, 1927..	73 ⁽²⁾	July 2, 1926 ⁽⁵⁾
	2nd	Jan. 26, 1928..	June 11, 1928..	138	208 d. ⁽⁶⁾
	3rd	Feb. 7, 1929..	June 14, 1929..	128	Sept. 14, 1926 ⁽³⁾
	4th	Feb. 20, 1930..	May 30, 1930..	100	Nov. 2, 1926 ⁽⁴⁾
17th Parliament.....	1st	Sept. 8, 1930..	Sept. 22, 1930..	15	May 30, 1930 ⁽⁵⁾
	2nd	Mar. 12, 1931..	Aug. 3, 1931..	145	3 y. 7 m. 0d. ⁽⁶⁾
	3rd	Feb. 4, 1932..	May 26, 1932..	113	July 28, 1930 ⁽³⁾
	4th	Oct. 6, 1932..			Aug. 18, 1930 ⁽⁴⁾

(¹) Including days (13) of adjournment from Mar. 3 to Mar. 15. (²) Not including days (54) of adjournment from Dec. 15 to Feb. 8. (³) Period of general elections. (⁴) Writs returnable. (⁵) Dissolution of Parliament. (⁶) Duration of Parliament in years, months and days. The life of a Parliament is counted from the date of return of election writs to the date of dissolution, both days inclusive. (⁷) The ordinary legal limit of duration for each Parliament is five years.

(In the session of 1932-33, Parliament sat from Oct. 6 to Nov. 25, 1932, and from Jan. 30 to May 27, 1933.)

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Do any of the members want to ask Mr. Kennedy any questions?

Mr. KENNEDY: I am more anxious that they take the matter up and deal with it. I did not feel that I should go on and enquire from employees or ask them to give me specific information. All this is information that has come to me generally.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much, Mr. Kennedy.

Before we proceed with the next witness, I have some correspondence here that I think perhaps I had better draw to the attention of the committee. The members of the committee will remember that we asked General Ross to submit a further statement in connection with the disability preference, and Mr. Bowler handed me a statement this morning which I think perhaps we can leave on file, and later on if we decide it should go into the record we will do so. In the meantime I will give it to the clerk. (See Appendix hereto.)

Then I have a memorandum submitted by Mr. Jacques in reference to dismissed employees, which reads as follows:—

To the Chairman and members of the Civil Service Committee,

Allow me to present a few facts for your consideration, so that you will have before you, when discussing the Service, and especially the conditions of the employees of the Department of Public Works, and other branches of the Service under what is known as prevailing rates employees, of which I was one since 1895 till August, 1933, at which time I was retired because of age; and having taken a prominent part in all things pertaining to the welfare of the men, I am, therefore, able to give a very clear and comprehensive statement of what we consider a very unfair and unjust treatment received by the employees in the above class.

From the year 1895 until the so-called reclassification of the Service, there were two distinct staffs of workmen; one was known as the Mechanical Staff, and the other the Repair Staff. The former comprised of Plumbers, Electricians, Steamfitters, Machinists, Blacksmiths, and Bell Hangers. This staff was paid a monthly salary from \$50 per month to \$87.50 per month; and had to work when called upon without any extra remuneration; and they were granted 10 days holidays and 2 weeks sick leave per year. The latter, made up of Carpenters, Painters, Tinsmiths, Labourers, etc. were paid at a rate per day, and 26 days per month comprised a working month. This was in force until the Hon. Mr. Pugsley became Minister of Public Works, when he granted them one day more per month making their month 27. Their rate of pay \$2.25 per day for tradesmen, and \$1.65 per day for labourers; and they were not given any privileges, except the 2 weeks sick leave.

In the year 1911 we appealed to the then Administration to place us under some form of pension scheme, whereby we would receive something upon being retired, and suggested that a fair way to all concerned would be to grant an employee, when he became unable to work because of old age or sickness, one month's pay for each completed year of service. This was to be given careful consideration, but the Administration changed a short time after our request was made, and we heard nothing more about it. Then the so-called reclassification was carried out and put into force, and all the above named staffs were put on what was known as Prevailing Rates, without being given a chance to say whether they were agreeable or not, and not allowed to present their side or show reasons why they should not be continued as before, although the Association and Federation protested against this scheme. We presented to the Department a salary scheme based on a fair and reasonable salary, whereby we would enjoy all the privileges enjoyed by the other civil servants, including superannuation. This scheme was defeated by a disgruntled minority of the employees who went to the then Hon. Minister, and represented themselves as representing the whole staff of prevailing rates, and when the authorized representatives of the men called on the Hon. Minister, he stated that he had already seen the delegation representing the men, and the case was closed. We, therefore, were put on prevailing rates and lost all the privileges, even to statutory holidays, that we had hitherto enjoyed. After years of patient waiting and working, through the efforts of the Members of Parliament for Ottawa, the Hon. Minister of Public Works, we were granted the following privileges which are now enjoyed by the staff. We were granted all the statutory holidays, and two weeks holidays, the Department granting one week and the men forfeiting one week's pay, which was to be deducted in 24 equal amounts. This was arrived at by taking 2,296 working hours per year and deducting 44 hours, making a total of 2,252 hours, which was multiplied by the rate per hour and then divided into 24 equal semi-monthly payments.

This, we consider, one of the most unfair acts that has been done by any Administration. There are a large number of former employees who, to-day, are enjoying life and drawing a pension under the Calder Act, and who did not contribute towards any superannuation.

At the end of the fiscal year 1931-32 the government decreased the staff under prevailing rates without giving them any thing but one month's notice, no pension nor bonus. Again in August, 1933, a number were retired, but they were granted one month's salary for each two years of completed service up to 12 years. Most of the men let out at the end of the fiscal year 1931-32 had long and honourable service and received

nothing, and we wish to draw to your attention their case when you are considering questions which will come before you regarding employees in their category, and when you are recommending the taking in of the prevailing rates employees into the permanent staff that you will grant such employees all privileges including superannuation, that you will make such privileges retroactive to include the men let out of the service in April 1932, and thereby rectify a very grave injustice to all such employees, some of whom have had 35 years of service, and have given the best years of their lives to the Government so that they would have something when they reached old age and unable to work any longer.

The foregoing is based on the facts of the case, and we are sure that you will give our plea your earnest and favourable consideration.

Thanking you for past favours, and in advance, for anything you may do for us in this connection, I remain,

FRED JACQUES.

To the Chairman and members of the Parliamentary Committee on Civil Service Affairs.

GENTLEMEN,—We, the ex-employees, of the Department of Public Works, who were retired from the service on account of economy in April, 1932, received nothing for our long and faithful service, most of us having from 15 to 40 years service. We were always known as a permanent staff, up to the time of the reclassification of the Service in 1919, being paid a monthly salary. After reclassification we were paid prevailing rates, which prevented us from receiving any of the benefits of the Civil Service, which we enjoyed previous to that time. In August, 1933, another group of employees were retired, being over the age limit, these employees received a gratuity of one month's pay for every two years of service up to 12 years.

A number of employees retired under the privileges of the "Calder Act," but we could not do so owing to certain clauses in this Act, namely, age-limit or disability. Also, we were told that the "Calder Act" was only a temporary one until such time as a new Superannuation Act was framed. The New Superannuation Act disqualified us from participating in any of its privileges, although we were willing to contribute to the fund.

We humbly pray, honourable gentlemen, that when you are considering the question of Superannuation and prevailing rates, that you will favourably consider our case, as we have clean records and honourable service.

We have a committee of five appointed, who would be only too pleased to answer any questions, that you would like to ask of them.

Your humble servants,
Ex-employees,

(Sgd.) F. JACQUES,
Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the committee would like to hear Mr. Jacques.

FRED JACQUES, called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. We have your memorandum under date of May 19th, and your letter of April 25, 1934. Have you anything to say in addition to what is set forth in these documents?—A. No more than to emphasize them a little, on behalf of the employees who were let out of the service, in April 1932, and also those who were let out of the service in 1933, but more especially the men who were let out

in 1932. Those men put in long service, and on being let out of the service they received no gratuity, none whatever. We contend it is hardly fair to the men let out in 1932. I was one of those let out in 1933 and we got a six month gratuity, and we cannot understand why the men let out in 1932 should not have got something.

Q. Were you in the same class as the men who were let out in 1932?—A. No.

Q. What different category?—A. I was let out on account of age.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. But you were all employees of the Public Works Department?—A. Yes, we were all employees of the Public Works Department, all mechanics, plumbers, carpenters and so forth.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. All those who were let out in 1933 got a gratuity of six months?—A. They all got a gratuity of six months, all those that were twenty years in the service or over, but the men that were let out in 1932 did not get a cent.

Q. Where does the distinction come in?—A. That is what we cannot understand. I put in 38 years and 5 months in the service of the government.

Q. Yes, but you are not complaining with regard to yourself?—A. No.

Q. Just those who were let out in 1932?—A. Yes, those especially.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. In 1933 those who were retired received one month's pay for every two years that they had served, and none of them were to exceed six months pay; that is all they got in 1933?—A. That is what we got.

Q. And those who retired in 1932 went out with barely any notice at all, and at any rate received no gratuity whatever?—A. Yes.

Q. And you say that is discrimination and you now speak on behalf of those men so that they may be treated in the same way that you were treated?—A. Yes, more if possible.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. Were all those retired in 1932 over the age limit?—A. Oh no, they were under the age limit.

Q. You state here that some of them had as much as forty years service; they would be very close to the age limit?—A. Yes, but they entered the service when they were very young. They were close to the age limit, yes. Years ago when we were not on prevailing rates we did not receive any overtime at all, just paid by the month, and we were always of the opinion that we would be taken care of when we were old, but times have changed. The men who were let out in 1932 were all married men with families and are left in a pretty bad position.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. And there is very little difference between their years of service and the years of service of those let out in 1933?—A. Oh, none at all.

Q. The conditions of work and years of service were similar?—A. Yes. We would like to see the Calder Bill brought back again if possible. I would come under that myself, but I am not speaking for myself, I am speaking for those who were let out in 1932; some of the best mechanics in the city are amongst them.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have here the notice attached to the memorandum, dated 27th February, 1932, which I presume might go in the record:—
Copy

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, CANADA

CHIEF ARCHITECT'S BRANCH

OTTAWA, 27th February, 1932.

Registered

DEAR SIR,—The Government has found it necessary to decrease the Vote for Maintenance of Public Buildings, Ottawa, from \$700,000.00 to \$397,300.00 for the year 1932-33. This will accordingly necessitate a substantial reduction in the Maintenance Staff of this Department at Ottawa, paid from this Vote.

I am, therefore, directed to inform you that under the circumstances it will not be possible to retain your services after the 31st March, 1932.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) T. W. FULLER,
Chief Architect.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. How many were retired in 1932?—A. 82, I think.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Any further questions from Mr. Jacques? Thank you, Mr. Jacques.

The WITNESS: I wish to thank you, sir, for the privilege of appearing before you.

WITNESS retired.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have also a memorandum addressed to the Chairman by one R. F. Manning, on behalf of five watchmen—R. W. McMillan, Arthur Lloyd, Ernest Vallance, A. R. Hinde, and R. F. Manning—asking to come under the Civil Service Act.

Then Mr. Esling, M.P., left with me a memorandum setting forth certain representations on behalf of the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board in British Columbia to come under the Civil Service Act in order to get the benefits under the Superannuation Act. That can be filed. We already have had representations from Mr. Phelan and General Ross.

Then I have a letter from Mr. J. P. Duggan, Secretary-Treasurer of the Veterans Association of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, making application on behalf of about 50 members of the Force to come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act in order to get the benefits of the Superannuation Act. That too will be filed with the secretary.

Mr. Knowles, National Secretary of the Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada, was to give us certain other information which is now to hand and will appear in the appendix hereto. (See appendix.)

Dr. Cotnam, M.P., left with me a memorandum on behalf of the staff of the Post Office at Pembroke.

Then there is a letter addressed to Mr. Fraser, as Secretary of the committee, sent forward by Charles D. Griffith, the Dominion Secretary of the Postmasters' Association, generally with respect to dismissals on the ground of political partisanship.

I think that pretty well disposes of all the matters which we have for attention saving certain representations which were submitted to each member by Miss Hart on behalf of the librarians. Miss Hart will appear later on. There is also a memorandum, copy of which has been left with each member of the committee on behalf of the Elevator staff, and I have arranged with their representative to appear before us at 12 o'clock.

Mr. Fraser has just handed me another memorandum which has been presented to-day by W. N. Duncan, National Secretary of the United Postal employees with respect to regulations. Mr. Fraser tells me that it covers sick leave, and matters of that kind.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, there are a few more that I would like to file, first, a memorandum on behalf of the foremen and assistant foremen of public works.

Then there is a letter just received this morning from Mr. W. H. Jackson to the Hon. Mr. Stewart with reference to obtaining further consideration from the Treasury Board for the Public Works against the operation of the drastic order recently made with reference to the Civil Service Act and annual leave of some of the employees.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: What department is that?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Public Works.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Stewart here?

ALEXANDER STEWART, called:

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. In what capacity do you appear before the committee?—A. Secretary of the Foremen and Assistant Foremen of the Public Works Department.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

OTTAWA, March 21st, 1934.

Hon. HUGH A. STEWART,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

SIR.—The Foremen and Assistant Foremen of the Public Works Department hereby pray that the Honourable the Minister be pleased to take the necessary measures to have the said Foremen and Assistant Foremen placed under the provisions of the Civil Service and Civil Service Superannuation Acts, on the same footing as other Civil Servants as regards superannuation, and, in so far as they may reasonably be made to apply, the other incidents of the said Acts. In support of such prayer, they respectfully request that the following representations be given due consideration.

While the said Foremen and Assistant Foremen would like to see all Public Works employees secure recognition of their claim to be placed under the said Acts, yet it must be recognized that their own case differs in many essential respects and should be considered on its own merits.

The Petitioners herein place their request upon—among others—the following important grounds.

1. *The Nature of the Work.*—The Foremen and Assistant Foremen have clerical duties to perform. In the regular course of their employment or at the request of the Superintendent of Government Buildings or the Chief Architect, they are often called upon to prepare and submit estimates of cost and reports on requirements or work done, and to carry on inspectorial duties with attending oral and written reports.

2. *The Responsibility Involved.*—A foreman's responsibilities will compare with that of Branch Heads of other Departments, not only in managing, directing and supervising his staff, but—as has been the frequent case in recent times—in carrying out the Government's policy of curtailing expenditure by the reduction of the staffs.

3. *Social Justice.*—It is now more than ever recognized that, as a matter of social justice, provisions for the superannuation of employees of long standing is an essential factor of any well-organized industry. Yet, in the Public Works Department, foremen with over 15 and 25 years of continued faithful service will soon be retired without any kind of pension for their old age.

4. *Anomaly Rectified.*—Under the present system, foremen and assistant foremen are debarred from departmental promotion because they do not come within the purview of the Civil Service Act. It has happened more than once that a foreman by his experience and special qualifications would have been the logical man and the best man from the viewpoint of efficiency, to appoint to some important position, but his appointment has been denied on account of the rules governing Civil Service promotions. By granting the present request, that anomaly would be rectified.

5. *Best Practice.*—It is the best practice in large industrial plants to provide a method of superannuation for at least the supervisors and foremen, not only on humanitarian grounds but because it is felt that better efficiency is secured from contented employees whose minds are at rest as to their own and their families' livelihood in their old age. We humbly submit that the Government not only should follow in this regard the best practice to be found in the industrial world but should itself set an example to the rest of the country.

We therefore impress upon the Government that on account of the nature of our work and the importance of our responsibilities, as a matter of justice and humanity, in conformity with the best practice and as a means of securing greater efficiency, the foremen and assistant foremen should be blanketed under the provisions of the Civil Service and Civil Service Acts, in so far as these may be made to apply.

And your Petitioners will never cease to pray.

Yours sincerely,

FOR THE COMMITTEE,

(Signed) ALEX STEWART,

Secretary.

Q. Does the memorandum cover your presentations fully?—A. Quite fully. I just thought there might be some questions asked arising out of the memorandum. What we are mostly concerned in is the right of superannuation and the right of promotion.

Q. You are not under the Civil Service Act at the present time?—A. No.

Q. And you make application to come under the act?—A. In as far as it may be made to apply in our case.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. With respect to these foremen, is it only for the city of Ottawa?—A. No, it would be a matter that would take in the whole Dominion; but outside of Ottawa there are only four foremen. There are eight foremen and four assistants in Ottawa, four in Montreal, and that is the whole list of foremen in the Dominion of Canada.

Q. Just twelve?—A. Twelve foremen and the four assistants.

Q. Those four assistants are from Ottawa too?—A. Yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. This represents the group on behalf of whom you make this application?—A. Yes.

Q. Generally speaking, the ground of application is that the foremen and assistant foremen are really permanent employees?—A. Well, they are everything from five years to thirty-two years in the service.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. But do they work the whole year?—A. Yes.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. No time off except ordinary leave?—A. Just the ordinary leave, yes.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. Is this the first time you have made application?—A. No, we have been making application right along since 1924, since the Calder Act went out of force. When it went out of force, naturally we thought something would take its place, but we have been disappointed so far.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Your employment is not part time at all?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is steady annual employment?—A. Yes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions you wish to ask Mr. Stewart?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.

The witness retired.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The secretary has handed to me another letter from Mr. Griffiths, the Dominion Secretary of the Canadian Postmasters Association with respect to superannuation for revenue postmasters. I will place the letter on file, and it will receive attention later on.

There is another letter here addressed to the Chairman of the committee from Thomas Doran, president of the International Accountants and Executors Corporation of Canada. The matter referred to in it, over which we will perhaps have jurisdiction, refers to the matter of superannuation. The contents of this communication will receive attention later on.

J. A. RENE PAQUIN, called.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You are the president of the Ottawa Elevator Operators Branch of the Civil Service Federation of Canada?—A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Q. You submitted a memorandum to the committee?—A. Yes.

OTTAWA ELEVATOR OPERATORS BRANCH OF THE CIVIL SERVICE FEDERATION OF CANADA

To the Parliamentary Committee on Civil matters:

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN,—We the Elevator Operators of the Dominion Government, humbly beg to submit the following for your kind consideration.

No. 1. Whereas our present salaries are minimum 1,080 dollars. Maximum 1,200 dollars per annum, except about 20 operators receiving a bonus of 60 dollars per annum and one operator receiving a special grant of 180 dollars per annum additional salary being employed on Privy Council elevator. Above salaries are subject to prevailing deductions. We feel that above salaries are inadequate and unfair in view of the following.

No. 2. Whereas we are qualified under the Civil Service Act and require a knowledge of all classes of electrically driven elevators and make minor repairs. Oiling, greasing and cleaning of mechanism in Government owned buildings. Whereas in rented buildings and buildings not occupied by the

Government, above work is done by the mechanic employed by the insurance company in which the elevator is insured.

No. 3. Whereas 96 per cent of our staff of 100 men are married with families of from 4 to 12 children and considered an asset to the Dominion. With a salary of 1,200 dollars per annum after deductions are made we find that the necessities of life are impaired to quite a degree such as medical, dental and many other cares which we cannot afford on our salary.

No. 4. Whereas we work 8 hours per day most Civil Servants work only 6½ hours per day. Most Civil Servants are allowed 1½ hours for lunch we are allowed only 1 hour.

No. 5. Whereas we are obliged to take our annual leave (en bloc) at the convenience of the department. Most Civil Servants can take their annual leave how and when best suited to themselves.

No. 6. Whereas some elevators in the Government service operate 24 hours per day, others operate from 5.30 a.m. to 11.00 p.m. daily, operators daily hours are broken up some operators having to do duty 3 different times for a few hours each day in order to complete the day, Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and Statutory holidays included.

No. 7. Whereas we are confined to elevators while on duty, were subject to disease coming in closer contact with the general public and being continually in a draft. As most of us are returned soldiers with war weakened bodies we are less resistant to disease than our constitutionally stronger fellow-man again bringing out the fact that we are inadequately paid. Medical care and medicine being expensive necessities. Also we feel in view of the above we should be given extra privileges in regard to sick leave.

No. 8. Whereas operating elevators in Government buildings is quite a responsible position and as there are practically no accidents to passengers or staff. We the elevator operators take our responsibilities seriously which indicates a very efficient staff, were this not so and an operator was not alert at all times, there would be difficulties as the general public relies upon an operator to safeguard them in their thoughtless moments.

No. 9. If we may compare elevator operators employed by the government with other employees in the Civil Service (not on clerical staffs) namely Postal Porters, Letter Carriers, Packers, Truckers, Revenue Department Char Service, House of Commons and Senate, Firemen, Caretakers. Above mentioned are paid higher salaries than we the elevator operators. Above mentioned with the exception of the Char Service House of Commons and Senate are eligible for promotion. Elevator Operators have no opportunity of promotion there being no higher position in our branch of the service at present. We humbly beg that when the government is considering the salary problem they will give our staff the kind consideration that other staffs in the **same category as ourselves** have received. Namely the staffs mentioned above.

No. 10. We humbly beg that special consideration be given Elevator Operators employed in House of Commons and Senate during session and suggest a bonus be granted them such, as the Electricians, Engineers, and Clerk of Works, are now in receipt of during session. This would also create an opportunity for promotion to higher salary on our staff.

No. 11. We humbly beg that consideration be given the position of Starter at the Confederation Building. Some time ago an operator from our staff was placed in charge of a number of elevators and their operators. He was given no extra remuneration. We feel in order to control any number of men and accept the responsibility of service in such as the Confederation Building, warrants extra remuneration placing the starter on a higher plane than just one of the boys. We suggest a higher classification for such positions, this would also create an opportunity for promotion for Elevator Operators.

No. 12. We are of the opinion that under the present system we are not justly supervised, our immediate supervision not coming under the Civil Service

Commission. We are supervised by one foreman and an assistant. One chief electrician and helper continually employed at every government building, except House of Commons and Senate on electric apparatus with no time to devote to elevator service. The other foreman and his assistant have thirteen electricians to supervise. These electricians cover the installation and repairs of electric apparatus including telephones in all government owned and government occupied buildings. These services scattered throughout the city demands a lot of attention on the part of the foreman and his assistant leaving very little time for the supervision of the elevator staff. On Saturday afternoons, Sundays and statutory holidays these supervisors are off duty but elevator service must be maintained in most of the buildings and the elevator staff on these days are left to shift for themselves. Our only time for communicating with our foreman is from 8.00 to 8.20 a.m. each day except the days above mentioned when there is no one in charge. Also some elevators operate 24 hours per day, others operate from 5.30 a.m. to 11.00 p.m. daily. There is no supervision before 8.00 a.m. or after 5.00 daily. In view of the above, we suggest that a practical supervisor and an assistant be appointed from our staff under the Civil Service Commission. To devote their time to the supervision of our staff which numbers approximately 100 men. The establishment of above would also create an opportunity for promotion on the elevator staff and would tend to make a good service a better one.

No. 13. Some time ago the position of inspector of elevators was abolished. As this position is a necessary one and elevators should in our opinion be inspected periodically as to the condition of cables, bolts, nuts, and many other parts of the mechanism, that may become loose or worn. We suggest that a capable man be appointed from our staff to perform this duty. We also suggest that the inspector have an assistant and they clean and oil the running gear as is done in non-government owned buildings but occupied by government departments.

No. 14. We have on our staff a number of operators appointed prior to the passing of the Civil Service Act. It is the desire of these men that they be appointed permanent either by an Order in Council or a certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission. These men have been employed on the elevator staff continuously for the past 33 years or less.

No. 15. Regarding Superannuation. We fully indorse the representations made and being made by our mother association namely The Civil Service Federation of Canada.

Unanimously adopted at executive meeting held March 2, 1934.

Humbly submitted.

Yours very truly,

J. A. RENE PAQUIN,
President.

JOHN D. GAW,
Secretary.

Q. And you desire to make some representations in addition to the memorandum which you left with the committee?—A. It is my desire to make some very brief observations with respect to a few clauses.

Q. All right, go ahead?—A. It has been intimated, Mr. Chairman, that salary classification will not come under consideration. Clauses No. 1 to 9 inclusive deal with classification. We will leave them with the hope that when it is considered advisable, some consideration will be given to those nine clauses.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We will do this for you. Mr. Bland is here. We will draw his attention to your representations as contained in those clauses. Will you make a note of that, Mr. Bland?

Mr. BLAND: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The WITNESS: Then, the next matter I would like to bring to the attention of your committee is with respect to clause 10 of the report, and that has reference to elevator operators employed in this building. The men who are selected to perform duties in this building are selected ones. Our association in the past has made representations to the department with the view that the entire staff rotate to assume duties in this building. This the department did not feel was advisable, owing to the fact that on our staff approximately 80 per cent are returned men, and a good many amongst them are disabled men, so that the duties as supposed to be performed in this building would be too strenuous for these men. The duties of these men in question, in this building, are very strenuous, although they work only 173 hours every four week period in comparison with our co-workers who are kept at their respective posts in other government owned or rented buildings, working an average of 176 hours. It must be admitted that the class of passengers that we are called upon to serve demand a more exacting service, and that a lot of privileges are lost by us in comparison with those others, such as having to do Sunday work, statutory holidays, and evening work. These are privileges we lose by assuming duties in this building. It is classed as special duty.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You lose those privileges?—A. Well, we lose them in a one way. We are called upon to work on Sunday, whereas our co-workers are off from one o'clock Saturday until eight o'clock Monday morning.

Q. How is it that your hours are shorter, then?—A. That comes in being off on Saturday. The hours are shorter because of night duty. As you will notice, the men in this building leave duty at 11.30, starting at 5, which is not the full eight hours, in the week they are on night duty; and alternating weekly, one week on days and one week on nights.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. On Sunday when they work, are they paid?—A. No, we are off on Saturday, but work on Sunday. The men claim that therefore they are off half a day for working a full day.

Q. Has this situation lasted very long?—A. Well, I have been employed in this building since 1921, and my recollection is that it has always applied in this manner. We work here under a system of shift relief.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. You say there in clause 10 that you suggest a bonus be granted?—A. Yes.

Q. Such as the electricians, engineers and clerk of works are now in receipt of during the session?—A. Yes. Some other classes of public works employees are in receipt of sessional bonuses, but they have to put in longer hours. These men are called upon to work from eight o'clock in the morning until the adjournment of the house in the evening at eleven o'clock, but they are paid some sort of bonus, what we term a sessional bonus.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. What is the amount of bonus they are paid?—A. That varies for the class of employees. You have men working on the engine plant; you have electricians; you have a clerk of works; these men are all called upon to start duty at eight or nine o'clock and work until the adjournment of the house in the evening.

Q. What is the amount of bonus to a man?—A. Well, I am informed it is somewhere around \$50 a man.

Q. Are you the only class who do not receive a bonus during the session, the elevator men?—A. Amongst the Public Works employees in this building?

Q. Yes.

Mr. MACINNIS: Well, he is just speaking for the elevator men.

The WITNESS: I think we are, with the exception of some special men that are called upon probably to go and do a day's duty here about once a month or probably once every second week, such as painting and so on.

By Mr. Laurin:

Q. How many elevator men work on Sunday? If you are off on Saturday you work on Sunday. How many elevator men do work on Sunday?—A. Approximately eight.

Q. And during the week?—A. During the week, approximately seventeen; that is not including the tower, and their relief.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. The question of bonus, you can realize comes under the same class as salary?—A. I quite realize that, Mr. Chairman.

Q. There was one other point you mentioned in connection with this. You suggested rotation of the employees?—A. We suggested that to the department some few years ago. The department didn't deem it advisable owing to the fact that there are numerous men that compose our staff who would not be fit to carry on the strenuous duty called for in this building.

Q. Are the elevator employees in the house favourable to a rotation of service at the present time?—A. I have various suggestions. Some men have suggested to me that five years should be the limit for any elevator man to serve here, and that they rotate the staff every five years. I had various suggestions. My executive has deemed it advisable that the bonus would be the most sound recommendation.

Q. What is your next representation?—A. Our next representation is with respect to a starter at the Confederation building. This man was appointed there under some sort of merit system some years ago, and we feel that the classification of that man should be higher, and with the rating given to the elevator operators, owing to the fact that he has to assume great responsibility.

Q. He is a sort of foreman?—A. Yes, he is a sort of foreman. We would submit, when the Civil Service Commission is called upon to classify this system, that they take the same correlating views that they took when they classified other positions in the service.

Q. What is the next representation?—A. The next clause has reference to clause 12. It deals with the present method of supervision of our staff. The consensus of opinion, formed over several years, is that the present method of supervision is inadequate. This conclusion has been arrived at only after a careful study by our various executives of the past. This is judging by the numerous complaints that we have received from time to time and the solution we had to apply to such. We find, with all due respect given to our department, at times the lines of least resistance are always used in connection with our problems; and as long as the service is maintained, we find that it does not matter under what conditions this service is maintained. I have all these various files here from the inception of the association, the various illustrations that we have devised, schedules for alternating shifts, taking up the annual leave question upon the submission of the department, and various other problems, as an illustration that the time is ripe to prove that the statement I have just made is quite correct.

Q. What do you suggest in regard to No. 12?—A. We suggest that the elevator operators be separated completely from the supervision of the electricians, the chief electrician, along with their helpers. Their minds are very much occupied with the kind of work they have to perform, the electricians and

their helpers. It does not leave sufficient time to look after the other elevator operators.

Q. What do you submit?—A. Our general opinion is that the practice of appointing the chief electrician in charge of the elevator operators is not a good practice; we believe, in order to have every inch of service required, a working arrangement for such could best be secured by supervision of an elevator operator. It is with this reason in mind, along with what our experience has taught us, that we believe the most suitable man for such a responsible position can best be secured amongst elevator operators.

Q. You suggest choosing a foreman for the staff in the building, from the staff itself?—A. Not exactly for the building.

Q. Generally?—A. I would recommend that the foreman's office be centralized. As an example, during the session, you can have your foreman right in this building, with an assistant patrolling the staff each day. I might make the statement that some of our men are patrolled once in a blue moon. If the employees of the R.C.M.P. were under a discipline such as the elevator operators, I think they would have some poor staffs. I suggest a man should be placed in this building, in charge of elevator operators in this building, with an assistant, with a view to patrolling the staff daily if possible, and making any recommendations or suggestions to improve the service. I think this suggestion will have a tendency to promote efficiency in general.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Your main point is that you want the superintendent to come from the elevator men and not from the electricians?—A. Not from the electricians. My point is that the electricians, as I stated, have got to look after the various electrical apparatus, supervise the electricians, and installations and so on that have to be attended to. His mind is solely occupied on that part of the work, and therefore the elevator operators are left to shift for themselves.

Q. And then at present does the superintendent—who is an electrician and looks after the electricians—look after both?—A. Yes. We claim as an Association that we are organized with a view to co-operating with the Department. Our Association is called upon to devise various kinds of schedules; these schedules are submitted to the Department and then when they are submitted I think the Department officials should use those schedules or keep them at least without calling upon the members of the Association to carry on such work, week in and week out.

By The Acting Chairman:

Q. All right, with regard to No. 13.—A. The next clause 13 is only a suggestion that we have to offer; it would be a protection against accidents. That deals with an elevator inspector. You have that in a commercial service where most elevators are inspected daily. We have repair men in the government service but their number is very limited. Formerly an inspector was employed but that position has been abolished. The Association take the view that an inspector should be appointed with a view to seeing that elevators are inspected regularly daily, and the cables and safety switches, circuits, in fact all the technical parts.

Q. Surely you have some inspection now?—A. We have in this building. A man is employed to look after this building but I am referring to other buildings outside where you have only two men whose time is taken up with repairs. You can call Local 197 and it might happen that about two hours afterwards the repair man is sent out. That all means delay. As I say, you have only two repair men for all the rented buildings in Ottawa. We have the Confederation Building and the National Research Building inspected by the Otis-Fensom Company; their men inspect those machines daily.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. Is that because of a guarantee that went with the sale of the elevators, or is it a contract to last a certain number of years?—A. I cannot give you the information with respect to that.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: All right.

The WITNESS: Another matter I want to deal with has reference to Clause 14:—

No. 14. We have on our staff a number of operators appointed prior to the passing of the Civil Service Act. It is the desire of these men that they be appointed permanent either by an Order in Council or by a certificate issued by the Civil Service Commission. These men have been employed on the elevator staff continuously for the past 33 years or so.

Through an Order in Council, or a ruling of the Justice Department these men—as the members are probably aware—were classed as seasonal employees. I have letters on file from our Deputy Minister—

By The Acting Chairman:

Q. You do not need to refer to them.—A. I would like to explain the real hardship that these men are under. In the event of these men losing their dependents—I have two cases at the present time of two men who lost their wives—they automatically dropped down to the minimum of the salary.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. We had that explained under the permanent temporaries. Mr. Knowles went into that pretty fully.—A. Our men contribute 5 per cent towards the Superannuation Fund.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. They do come under the Superannuation Act then?—A. Yes sir, they do come under the Superannuation Act.

Q. But they are not in the Civil Service, not civil service employees under the Act?—A. They are civil service employees. I have the ruling here—

Mr. CHEVRIER: There are some very funny anomalies.

The WITNESS: It interferes with our seniority problem and it is a real hardship to these men.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. We can take it for granted that you are not directly under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, but you do have the right to contribute to the Superannuation Fund?—A. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I am alluding to just 22 men, appointed under ministerial authority prior to 1919.

Q. Prior to what?—A. Prior to 1919. Some of them have had very long service. I have a case in mind here of a man who has been superannuated just recently. This man refused to contribute under the Superannuation Act, and when he was let go he only received one month's retiring allowance. Had this man been blanketed in he would have received a much larger retiring allowance, something like six months' retiring allowance; and it is the same with the other 21.

Q. Well, did these men prior to 1919 at any time have the right to elect whether or not they would come under the Act?—A. They had the right to come under the Act.

Q. But they did not choose to elect?—A. One man only refused and to-day he has been superannuated. The remaining 21 who are on the staff elected to come in, but what they want is their permanent status; they feel that they are denied permanent status.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. That is, after having been appointed by ministerial authority, as you have just explained, it makes them eligible under the Superannuation Act but it does not make them permanent in the way of civil servants because another ministerial authority may put them out, whereas if they were classified as full-fledged civil servants under the control of the Civil Service Act then they could only be dismissed or let out according to the Civil Service law, but as it is now, the ministerial authority that put them in can put them out, therefore, they are not in a sense civil servants as the other civil servants who are appointed by the Civil Service Commission.

By Mr. MacInnis:

Q. They are not eligible for promotion?—A. As a matter of fact, complaints have been pouring into our executive all last week. Last fall we made representations to the Department that they use the same procedure as the Civil Service Commission in filling vacancies. We have recommended that these vacancies be advertised and that applications be invited, and these men that I refer to are complaining because the argument that is used is that they are not permanent under the Act, and according to the Act promotions are only eligible for permanent employees.

MR. CHEVRIER: After they have been appointed by Order in Council. You see the point, Mr. Bowman.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: I understand. Mr. Bland, would you make a note in connection with that matter?

MR. BLAND: They are all included, Mr. Chairman, in this memorandum.

THE WITNESS: I think I have three amongst those men who were appointed through the recommendation of the Soldier Re-establishment Board. That completes our submission, Mr. Chairman. I am very grateful to you and to the members of the committee for the courteous hearing you have afforded us.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have your representations. You will understand quite clearly that most of the representations really have reference to matters of salary and classification over which this committee, you will appreciate, has no jurisdiction.

THE WITNESS: You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that we stress the point in our recommendations, when it would be deemed advisable by the committee, when the country is in a more prosperous condition, then we might expect some action, but as it stands now we quite realize that we are facing difficulties the world over and we would not expect or try to impose our recommendations on the government at this time. They are only set out there with a view to filing them and at a later date when thought advisable they could be considered then.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: We will do two things: We will draw your recommendations to the attention of the Civil Service Commission, and to the Department under which you come.

THE WITNESS: One point, Mr. Chairman, that my executive wishes me to stress and submit for the consideration of this committee, and which they ask that you give full consideration to if possible, is with respect to our method of supervision. We encounter a lot of difficulty in connection with that, and we believe that if another method would be established money would be saved because these men would be able to devote their entire time to the service and probably would be a check on the over-lapping working arrangements that you have at the present time.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, those are matters coming really within the jurisdiction of your Department. We will draw the attention of your Department to your representations in that connection.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Chairman, that shows the necessity of appointing a special committee, not a grievance committee but a committee of civil servants so that they could pass on these things without bringing them here when we have no jurisdiction to listen to them.

Witness retired.

GRACE HART called.

The WITNESS: I prepared a statement, Mr. Chairman.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Miss Hart, you appear on behalf of?—A. The Departmental Librarians and the Organized Government Librarians.

Q. And what is your official position?—A. Departmental librarian in the Department of External Affairs.

Q. But in regard to the organization?—A. I am representing the librarians whose qualifications have admitted them to the Professional Institute, but we are not large enough to constitute a complete group in that organization. We are not appealing for a recognition and reclassification of those particular librarians alone. All we are interested in is the placing of library work throughout the service on a uniform professional footing.

Q. All right. The members of the committee, Miss Hart, have gone over the report which you submitted to us on May 15, and outside of the matter to which you have just referred it appears to cover two main questions: The question of salary and the question of classification; is that correct?—A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Q. The question of salaries and classification really does not come within the jurisdiction of this committee. The matter of salaries is a departmental and Civil Service Commission matter. Classification is too, as you know.—A. Yes.

Q. Now, we will draw the attention of the committee to the representations which you have made, and I would suggest that perhaps you devote your remarks to the question of uniformity over which perhaps we may have some jurisdiction.—A. Very well, Mr. Chairman:

SITUATION IN OTTAWA

Excluding the Library of Parliament and the Library of the Supreme Court, there are *approximately 30 Government libraries* and book collections ranging in size from 700 to 121,000 volumes.

At the head of 11 of these libraries and collections are 8 Departmental Librarians Grade 2 and 3 Departmental Librarians Grade 3.

Of the 11 Departmental Librarians, 8 have been recognized by the Professional Institute of the Civil Service as having professional qualifications in education, training and experience. (Namely the libraries of the Geological Survey, Mines Branch, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and of the Departments of Agriculture, National Defence, Marine, Trade and Commerce, and External Affairs.)

The Librarian of the National Research Council would be eligible but for her classification as Assistant Research Chemist.

The majority of the collections are under the care of clerks, and stenographers, classed as such.

There has been no rigid insistence on the uniform requirements which we would have exacted, and consequently there are great divergencies in the level of organization and efficiency of Departmental Libraries.

These inequalities are the result of departmental policy. Departments with foresight place qualified people at the head of their libraries and in assistant-

ships. Indifferent Departments are content to let material merely accumulate under the care of the unqualified.

And as we will show later, the low classification of librarians permits and encourages the introduction of the less qualified to administrative posts in Departmental Libraries.

What we request is not the re-classification of 7 or 8 individual librarians nor the liquidation of those without the qualifications of university degree, library school training and experience.

What we ask is that future appointments to library positions of a responsible nature be on the basis of these qualifications.

The point we wish to stress above all others is the necessity of university education and full library school training for the successful administration of government libraries. Neither of these qualifications alone is sufficient, and they should be rounded out by experience in libraries. But mere length of service in a departmental library or in any library does not constitute sufficient background for the position of head librarian in a Government library.

Because classification is involved, will the House of Commons Select Committee turn its back upon a situation affecting the organization of information sources throughout the Government Service?

If mapping, engineering and translation services are seen to affect Government efficiency and economy, surely the organization of its information centres is of equal Government concern.

Libraries are the reservoirs on which not only entire departments but other departments and outside institutions draw. Libraries are the research centres of the Government. Napoleon said that an army travelled on its stomach. Government departments travel as far as their information resources carry them.

Progress in Parliament is intimately bound up with library efficiency.

For instance: the Minister of Agriculture speaks on the Marketing Bill. He may not know that he has a library but trace his ammunition to its source and you will realize that the completeness of his information is originally due to the careful checking, selection and organization of material by the Librarian of the Department of Agriculture, so that on call material on marketing legislation and systems throughout the world can be speedily assembled.

There come up in Parliament the question of continuing membership in the League of Nations. How much has Canada contributed to the League financially as compared with other countries? What does Canada get from the League in proportion to what she contributes? The answers to these questions must be found in the library of the Department of External Affairs.

We ask you to look into the library situation in your own interests.

Government libraries like university libraries should lead research and investigation throughout Canada. They are supported by the tax-payer; they should make returns on his investments.

They are in a favoured position to arrange international exchanges of publications. They receive material secured with difficulty by other institutions. Banking firms, business houses, boards of trade, clubs, professors and students turn to their resources. They receive highly confidential material of current importance and historical value. If not classified, catalogued and preserved according to modern library practice, this material will neither obtain current use nor reach the Public Archives.

From all the movements of the times the untrained librarian is divorced through ignorance and lack of professional contacts.

Libraries throughout the United States and Europe are arranging to specialize in particular fields so as not to duplicate material unnecessarily. They are co-operating in inter-library loan, exchange of duplicates, in bibliography projects, in cataloguing through central libraries like the Library of Congress. London and Washington have Union Catalogues so that the library resources of two large cities are known to research workers. Ottawa has no Union Catalogue of the

material in all its Government libraries. Some of its collections have never been catalogued; some of its librarians don't know how to classify and catalogue according to modern library practice; in some departments material has not even been centralized under the care of one person.

On the one hand there are libraries like the Geological Survey, Mines Branch, Department of Agriculture and Dominion Bureau of Statistics libraries, known to research workers across Canada. On the other hand, there are collections under the direction of incompetents, whose inefficiency leads officials to shelve important material in their own rooms. There is no central catalogue, no circulation record. Material goes astray. When needed in a hurry, S.O.S. calls are sent to the Library of Parliament and to other departments, sometimes to our Department of External Affairs, where our distribution records show that the material desired—a League document, let us say—had been sent to that department a year before.

The field of each department is naturally specialized. Each department should be an authority in that field, its information complete, producible without delay. Departments, however, are not watertight compartments, they must interchange material at times, and where material is not forthcoming from its logical source, other departments will build up duplicate collections. If each departmental library should be self-sufficient like the national self-contained economic units one hears advocated, well and good, but is it government economy?

One recommendation of the Treasury Board Committee on Printing and Stationery appointed in 1932 concerned the administration of departmental libraries and duplication in book and periodical ordering.

If qualified librarians are installed in departmental libraries they can be counted on the exchange accession lists to keep one another posted as to library contents and to arrange inter-library loans.

There are two types of library work:

- (1) the purely clerical, such as the routine stamping of periodicals, receipt checking on cards, and labelling of books, all of which require no particular educational background and certainly no Library School training. Neatness and accuracy are what is called for.
- (2) responsible work, such as book selection, classification, cataloguing, reference and abstracting, which call for university and library school education and administrative ability, judgment, memory and speed.

In the Civil Service of the United States the division is marked between the Professional and Sub-professional Services. In Canada the classification and salaries of librarians are low, we suggest, not because librarians are mostly women, as Miss Inglis stated in her evidence of May 30th, but through identification of library work with its purely clerical side.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY LIBRARIANSHIP AS A PROFESSION? WHY DOES GOVERNMENT LIBRARY WORK EXACT THESE QUALIFICATIONS?

Webster defines a librarian as one who has charge and custody of books.

The American Library Association would define a Librarian as one trained in the use of books in their relation to people with the minimum qualifications of four years' university education for general preparation and subject background and one year's Library School training to learn the tools and practice of his or her calling.

In the United States and Canada a post-graduate one year course gives the degree of B.L.S. while short summer courses are given for library assistants.

In Great Britain the Library Association offers fellowships to successful candidates in examinations in languages (2 besides English is the minimum),

literature and library processes, while the University of London has a graduate school that trains librarians for University and other library posts requiring subject specialization.

The old type of librarian in Europe was a scholar who jealously guarded from all but the chosen few the legacies of the ages.

In the United States the emphasis has been placed upon library technique, organization of material and efficiency of system to ensure that material's reaching all desiring it in the shortest possible time.

To-day we see the merging of these ideals and the rise of librarianship as a profession.

American library technique has spread across the world.

Go as far as Moscow and you will see the Dewey Decimal Classification Scheme. The head of the Moscow Library Institute or school for librarians is American trained.

The Dewey Decimal Classification is used in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and India.

In Europe the Brussels modification and expansion of the Decimal Classification, the Brussels International Decimal Classification, prepared by the Institut International de Documentation, is extensively used and has been adopted by the League of Nations Library at Geneva.

University libraries in Great Britain, Canada and the United States as well as the federal government libraries at Washington follow the Library of Congress system. And when the Vatican wished to reorganize its library it called upon Charles Martel of the Library of Congress to classify it.

Conversely in the New World, the European ideal of scholarship is increasingly appreciated. The necessity of subject knowledge to bibliography, research and authorship is realized. In the Library of Congress and university libraries, chiefs of divisions are subject authorities as well as library technicians.

If both scholarship and library training are needed in university library work where the librarian must serve professors and students competently, are they not equally needed in Government Departmental libraries where the librarian must meet the calls of Masters and Doctors of Science, Rhodes Scholars in economics and history, lawyers, graduate experts in special fields in departments where research and investigation are carried on often under pressure of time?

Shall I discuss the necessity of University education, library school training and so forth? These points, we feel, have not been uniformly insisted on.

Q. You have covered that in a general way in the presentation just made?—A. Yes.

Q. You suggest there in one place one year's experience plus a four years University course.—A. But the classification as it is at present does not insist on a university education for departmental librarians grades 1 and 2.

Q. Well, if you care to say something on that subject.—A. Yes, because we think it is rather important.

University education gives the Departmental Librarian subject background. It will be readily seen that the librarian of a science library should have a knowledge of chemistry, physics, biology, and geology; that the librarian of a library specializing in the social sciences should have a knowledge of economics and history. In all, languages are needed—French, of course, and German.

Much may be picked up by home study but the university graduate starts off with an initial advantage, does not learn these subjects at the expense of the department, and can give home study to the acquisition of further knowledge.

Library School gives intensive courses in library organization and administration, in principles and practice of classification, cataloguing, book selection

and ordering, reference work, bibliography compiling, indexing, filing, book binding and repair, library architecture and equipment, and circulation systems, all supplemented by visits to public and special libraries.

Too often Library School courses, being called library training, are identified with or thought the equivalent of training acquired in a particular library.

There is no comparison, library school training giving a survey of systems and processes in use throughout the organized library world, shortening the subsequent period of apprenticeship in libraries. Apprenticeship alone trains only in the systems installed in one or two particular libraries.

Library experience gives practical application of principles taught at library school over a more extended period of time in a particular type of library in a particular line of work,—the reference department of a public library, the cataloguing branch of a university library. The longer that experience the more valuable the librarian in a library of the same type.

There is experience and experience. Experience in filing cards, bookplating and receipt stamping would be of no particular benefit to the prospective cataloguer in a departmental library—there, subject knowledge of the material to be catalogued and experience in actual cataloguing count.

Admission to responsible library positions in the government service should not be on the basis of experience alone, above all experience in routine work.

An orderly in a hospital, if observant and alert, will gather much information but he would not be permitted to operate on the basis of long service in the hospital.

Similarly a law reporter will become familiar with legal terminology but must take his examinations before being called to the bar.

University education gives grasp of what is wanted. Library school training tells where to get it. The combination of the two makes for speed.

If asked to supply immediately the text of the Platt Amendment the librarian's history course connects the reference with Cuba and the United States. Her Library School training tells her to look in Larned's History for Ready Reference.

If called upon to organize a library and install a classification system, the librarian with only apprenticeship in a single library behind her will tend to install the system with which she is familiar, irrespective of whether that system is the best suited to the type of library in which she now finds herself. The library school graduate knows that the Dewey Decimal Classification is much used by scientific libraries and large public libraries, that the Library of Congress system is used by the majority of university libraries in the United States and Canada, by the Government departments, at Washington, and by a number of libraries specializing in international affairs. If a classification needs expansion, her university courses and library school practice in classification expansion have prepared her to undertake this work.

In the matter of book selection, the trained librarian uses her initiative; instead of merely accepting like manna what material reaches the library, she will draw to the attention of the deputy minister gaps in the library collection and important publications.

In brief the Library School graduate with university education has been trained to carry responsibility.

As we pointed out in our memorandum, research, bibliography, compiling, indexing, abstracting, and translating are done in the organized libraries of the Government service. These tasks and the checking and ordering of publications, the supervision of staff, the following of current legislation and events, draw upon all the educational resources of the librarians at their heads.

That is why they ask that these qualifications (university education, library school training, and experience) be uniformly insisted upon for admission to

library posts, that their assistants and successors be more rather than less trained than they were on entrance to their present positions.

Misfits in other lines of work have been shoved into libraries on the assumption that library work was nice, easy work and that they were better shelved there than anywhere else. Library work is nice work in the sense of exactness, precision, fineness, detail. It would be truer economy and kindlier charity for the government, to pay their salaries and let them stay at home than to take up the time and nervous energy of librarians in directing and checking their work.

Again chief clerks, ex-ministers' secretaries, have been thrust into libraries receiving higher salaries than Departmental Librarians Grade 3 and confidently expecting to succeed them, cutting off the hopes of promotion from library assistants with training and experience.

The whole reorganization of library positions depends upon classification and salary revision, Mr. Chairman. I do not see very well how it can be left out.

Q. Quite true, but I do not think that this committee can interfere in the matter of salaries or classification. That is really beyond our authority. We have your representations and we shall see that they reach the right source, but while agreeing with your statement, we can probably make some recommendation along the line of your presentation which you have just made to us to-day although I do not see how this committee can very well deal with salaries which is a purely departmental matter. And classification, as you know, comes within the purview of the Civil Service Commission.—A. Oh yes.

Q. I can, of course, see that if you are going to put the librarians on a basis which you seem to think is proper the matter of salary and classification is of vital importance.—A. I do not see, Mr. Chairman, how any alteration could be effected merely by the attention of the department being drawn to the anomalies of the situation. They are really responsible for the inequalities.

Q. Quite true, and the responsibility will still remain with them. The point I am making is that the responsibility for salaries and classification does not remain with this committee. We would have great difficulty on our hands if we were to deal with the salaries of the different departments throughout the whole Civil Service in Canada, or the matter of classification. That is why the Civil Service Commission was set up, just to deal with those very matters.

Mr. BLAND: If the committee could give the Civil Service Commission a copy of Miss Hart's excellent submissions we will be very glad to consider them at an early date.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I just mentioned to Miss Hart that we would see that these recommendations did reach the Commission.

Mr. BLAND: We will be very glad to have them.

By Mr. Chevrier:

Q. You have submitted a memorandum but you have read from another. You have recommendations which apparently refer to salaries and classification. In the one which you have submitted now did you make any changes in these recommendations?—A. With regard to salary?

Q. Yes?—A. No, they are substantially the same.

Q. I agree with what the Chairman has just said, that the question of salaries and classification is somewhat outside our jurisdiction, but I feel sure everybody would be pleased to send your recommendations to the Civil Service Commission and ask them if they cannot help you out. We would be delighted if they could.—A. That is what we would like.

Q. That I think is your line of attack.

Mr. MACINNIS: I think Miss Hart understands that this committee is not competent to make a definite report in regard to classification and salaries, but this committee is competent—if we think the situation demands it—to refer this matter of salaries and classification to the proper authorities, with our

recommendation that we believe that the present classifications do not meet the requirements, and that we believe they ought to be changed. That is the most, I think, that we can do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have your recommendations at the bottom of page 5, and we will see that these are brought to the attention of the Civil Service Commission and also to the departments concerned, and the very fine presentation which you have just made in connection with the qualification of librarians generally will be taken into consideration by the committee, and we may make some recommendation with respect to them.

The WITNESS: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I should read the points with regard to salary increases and the promotion to senior library assistant should changes not be made immediately.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Why don't you put that in your memorandum, Miss Hart. I will be very glad to listen to you, but you might put it in the form of a memorandum and let us have it and, as I said a moment ago, we will be very glad to recommend to the Civil Service Commission that they look into that and see if they cannot meet your wishes.—A. Well, that is stated in concise form in the memorandum which I have left with you.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think it is pretty well summarized in this memorandum:—

2. CLASSIFICATION AND SALARY REVISION.

At present there are the positions or classes of Library Assistant, Senior Library Assistant, and Librarian, as well as Departmental Librarian Grade 1, 2, and 3, which overlap both in qualifications exacted and salaries given.

Class	Salary	Increase
Librarian	\$1,920-2,520	\$120
Departmental Librarian Grade 3	\$1,800-2,220	\$60
Senior Library Assistant	\$1,380-1,800	\$60
Departmental Librarian Grade 2	\$1,440-1,800	\$60
Library Assistant	\$1,080-1,380	\$60
Departmental Librarian Grade 1	\$1,140-1,440	\$60

In practice the classes of Senior Library Assistant and Librarian are becoming obsolete. The position of Librarian is held by one Librarian in the Civil Service, the Librarian of the Dominion Observatory.

The classification requirements for library positions assume steady advancement from the position of Library Assistant, for which two years' High School education alone is required, to Departmental Librarian Grade 2, for which 4 years' High School is required, on the strength of experience acquired in libraries alone. Full Library School training is mentioned as desirable but since one year courses are now post-graduate, High School students could not take them.

Progress on the basis of long service is inconsistently cut short at Grade 3 by the requirements of University education, command of English and French, and one year's Library School training.

The point is that whether a library be large or small, it should be an efficient working tool. The installation of system calls for the same qualifications and the same hard initial work in both cases. Two years' High School education could not install the Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress Classifications or expand classifications in geology and international law.

In practice many departments call for the University degree and Library School training for the positions of Library Assistant and Departmental Librarian Grade 2, but though Grade 3 qualifications are asked for to do Grade 3 work in the case of the positions of Departmental Librarians Grades 1 and 2, the salary given remains that given two and four years' High School education, so that a premium is placed on ignorance and inequalities in library develop-

ment arise. Any department so choosing may call an untrained clerk or stenographer Departmental Librarian. What's in a name?

Government librarians in Great Britain receive salaries of from £400-500, £500-700, £650-750, and in the case of the librarian of the Foreign Office £800-1,000.

In the United States, the Government library sub-professional service in most instances is paid more than the professional librarians of the Canadian Government. Principal Library Assistant in Grade 7 of the United States sub-professional service receives \$2,300-2,900, a salary higher than that of Departmental Librarian Grade 3 with the University degree, Library School training and twenty years' experience in library work. (\$1,800-2,220).

The professional service librarians in the United States receive salaries ranging from \$2,000-2,600 for Grade 1, Junior Assistant Librarian, to \$4,600-5,400 for Grade 5, Senior Librarian. The librarian is ranked in the same grade with economists, attorneys, statisticians and entomologists.

In the Library of Parliament where the staff is male, Reference Librarians receive \$3,120-3,720 and \$2,520-3,000. Cataloguers receive \$1,740-2,400. All secure \$120 increases. Have the Reference Librarians and Cataloguers of the Library of Parliament more responsible positions and higher qualifications than the librarians at the head of Departmental libraries?

Excluding the Library of Parliament and the Supreme Court staff, only the Librarian of the National Research Council receives a salary commensurate with her professional qualifications and the responsibility of her work—\$2,820-3,300.

So when they want promotion, librarians must acquire a new name—Research Clerk, Permanent Research Assistant or as in one case Assistant Research Chemist, because the name librarian, a name which in Europe connotes scholarship, a name which has been won by study not only before but continuously since entrance to Government positions by the librarians at the head of such libraries as those of the Department of Agriculture, Geological Survey and Mines Branch, has been given to those who have not earned it.

Appeals of individuals to Deputy Ministers do not benefit the library service as a whole. Therefore we recommend the exaction of uniform requirements for a new scale of positions, the titles of which make clear their degree of responsibility and the salaries of which are more commensurate with the nature of the work done.

3. SALARY INCREASES OF \$120 FOR DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIANS, GRADE 3.

Examination of the Civil Service Classification Lists shows that of salaries having a minimum of between

\$1,300-\$1,400,	14	carry an annual increase of \$120.
1,400- 1,500,	22	" " " 120.
1,500- 1,600,	25	" " " 120.
1,600- 1,700,	33	" " " 120.
1,700- 1,800,	13	" " " 120.
1,800- 1,900,	83	" " " 120.

The minimum range of the 190 classes listed above is \$1,300-\$1,860 and these classes receive an annual increase of \$120.

There are but two classes in the entire Civil Service with a minimum of \$1,800 and a maximum of \$2,220 which carry an annual increase of \$60—Departmental Librarian, Grade 3, and Poultry Market Specialist.

The class Librarian (\$1,950-\$2,520), the Librarian and Assistant Librarian of the Supreme Court, the Librarian of the National Research Council, the Assistant Librarian, Reference Clerks, Cataloguers, Senior Bookbinder, and Library Clerk-Book-keeper of the Library of Parliament, all receive annual increases of \$120.

We therefore request that until librarianship is placed on a professional footing that the annual increase for Departmental Librarian, Grade 3, be \$120.

4. PROMOTION TO THE POSITION OF SENIOR LIBRARY ASSISTANT FOR QUALIFIED LIBRARY ASSISTANTS

The position of Senior Library Assistant exists but is not occupied at present. Librarians have sought promotion to this class for Library Assistants doing responsible work but since the salary range of Senior Library Assistant approximately coincides with that of Departmental Librarian, Grade 2, an administrative position, promotion has not been granted. And so university graduates translate French and German and do reference work for \$1,080-\$1,380 and see no prospects of promotion at the end of six or seven years' experience in the larger libraries of the service.

We request that the position of Senior Library Assistant be open to qualified Library Assistants who have served many years in the departmental library.

DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARIES IN OTTAWA

Extracts from "Libraries in Canada, a Study of Library Conditions and Needs," by the Commission of Enquiry. John Ridington, Chairman, Mary J. L. Black, George H. Locke. Toronto, The Ryerson Press, and Chicago, The American Library Association, 1933. A survey conducted on funds supplied by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

"The Dominion of Canada and each of its nine provinces maintain official libraries. From whatever standard they may be measured, they exhibit wide variations alike in the premises they occupy, in equipment, in volume total, in nature and range of organization, and in efficiency of service. These differences have their roots in the differences of perception—or, lack of perception by constituted Canadian authority as to the usefulness, importance, or necessity of libraries as parts of the necessary machinery of governments, and, further, of the varying viewpoints of these authorities of any obligation to promote research and diffuse knowledge throughout the nation by means of the printed page.

The unassailable fact is that Canada is far behind Germany, France, the United States, and Great Britain in these perceptions and realizations. In consequence, the official libraries of the Dominions and its provinces, taken by and large, suffer greatly by comparison with those of the United States and several countries in Europe. For this condition the librarians in charge are but little to be blamed—and perhaps those responsible for their appointments should not be subject to too severe criticism either. Until recently, in Canada librarianship has not been considered a profession—an occupation requiring not only natural intelligence and a broad background of education but also special technical training. The journalist who had done yeoman service for a party—one who could dig up facts and write a good speech for a politician to deliver; a defeated alderman, or member of legislature or parliament; a minister of the Crown desirous of retiring from the hurly-burly of politics—if there happened to be a vacancy in a public or provincial library, or in that of Parliament, why not give such a person the appointment? Professional training was, of course, a necessary prerequisite to an appointment on a legal, a medical, or an engineering board, but for a librarian, such technical preparation was (until recently) considered quite unnecessary. If a man were interested in books, so much the better. What more was required? The labour was light and the duties not very responsible, while the emoluments of the sinecure were such as to constitute a gracious and acceptable recognition of personal favour or party service.

Under these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that there is very little enthusiasm for either a scholarly or a democratic book service in most of the libraries of the various governments of Canada"

"The Library of Parliament, though the largest and best known of those sustained by the Dominion Government, is but one of many such institutions. In all, there are between thirty and forty departmental libraries in Ottawa alone. All are special libraries, organized and maintained for purposes of record or research, and principally used by the technical staffs of the various branches of the Canadian Government. Some are quite extensive collections; that of the Secretary of State has 100,000 volumes; the Mines Branch has 30,000 (now 38,734); that of the Geological Survey 50,000 (now 69,613); the Bureau of Statistics 60,000; and the Department of Agriculture nearly 30,000 (now 67,000). All those named, and several not so large, are effectively organized and administered. Some of them—as the Mines, Geological Survey and Agriculture Libraries—are known and widely used as libraries of reference by specialists throughout, and even outside, Canada. Experimenters in soil and livestock, foresters, miners, geologists, economists, labour leaders, and others, frequently refer to them for information."

WORK DONE BY ORGANIZED GOVERNMENT LIBRARIES

The work done by the organized Government Libraries covers a wide range of activities from the basic routines of book ordering, accessioning, cataloguing, circulation, and binding, to book selection, research, bibliography compiling, abstracting or précis writing, indexing, translation, correspondence, and general administration, involving knowledge of subject matter and reference tools in a variety of fields, the use of foreign languages, thorough knowledge of library technical processes and systems, and the character traits of judgment, critical analysis, memory, speed, and organizing and executive ability.

The subject sphere of the Government Library is highly specialized; its clientèle are experts; the material handled consists chiefly of official documents calling for detailed indexing and scholarly research, e.g. the publications of the League of Nations, which, during the early years when the League was groping for a satisfactory system of subject arrangement and numbering, taxed the skill of government and university librarians throughout the world.

Book selection, the ordering of foreign documents, and the arrangement of exchanges of publications with foreign government departments and institutions call for many hours of work, the study of current periodicals and document indexes in many languages.

Library accession lists are distributed not only within the department but to other libraries and interested institutions by the larger libraries of the Government service. The Library of the Department of Agriculture distributes a bi-monthly survey of current literature to about 2,000 officials.

The following are a few titles of bibliographies prepared in the Departmental Libraries during the past year:—

Intermediate credit, Illegitimate speculation in wheat, Mosaic diseases of plants; Social insurance in Canada, Census reports on blind and deaf, Trade, Empire or domestic as opposed to foreign, Commercial organization of importing markets, The Dairy industry, especially in the Argentine, Australia, Denmark and New Zealand; The Arctic, Geophysical prospecting, Ice recession, Anhydrite; Tariffs and world peace, Canada's relations with the Far East, Canada and the League of Nations, Disarmament, The Foreign policies of Great Britain and the United States.

Indexes of departmental publications have been prepared and revised in a number of the departments by the library.

Typical of *reference questions* looked up are the following: Laws enacted and assistance rendered by the Government in other countries to the farmer; Methods adopted in other countries to insure the orderly marketing of surplus products such as wheat, fruit, tobacco, eggs, bacon, etc; The Cost of the Great War to the British Empire and the number of wounded of the Empire and of Canada alone; The official steps if any taken by Canada to join the Pan-American Union; The dielectric strength of mica; Processes in use for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. What have you in the library on the analysis of ferrosilicon 50% pure? This information is to be cabled to the British Admiralty where it is used 80% pure.

Research is a prominent part of library work and summaries of information are often prepared when books cannot be sent out.

Translation of scientific publications and correspondence is done in a number of the Departmental Libraries.

The Departmental Libraries exist primarily for expert use but the growing number of requests for explanatory material, free bulletins, and references on Canada's constitution and Government organization, foreign policy and trade with other countries, and on international relations in general, not only from students and club women but the ordinary man in the street shows the demand of a larger public that looks to the Government Departments for education and leadership.

Responsibility.—To provide the fullest use of rich resources available is the aim of the Departmental Librarian. Her's is a responsible position whether it be at the head of a small library just launched on its career with all the hard work of organizing material, installing systems and expanding classification schedules to suit the detailed nature of subject matter, or whether it be at the head of a large library of several hundred thousand volumes with many assistants and wide public contacts. She must pulse with the times, follow the developments of her subjects, government legislation, current events, proceedings of conferences, etc. In brief she must be an expert serving experts. The study for this work is never ended.

Classification and Salaries.—The above instances of work done by Departmental Libraries have been mentioned to show its value and the education, training and experience required by the administrative head of a Departmental Library. Salaries in Ottawa and classification gradings, however, are not commensurate with the responsibility of the positions held.

Library Work: A Profession.—Librarianship in the United States and Great Britain is a profession with definite standards, position rankings, and salaries proportionate to the educational background, library training and experience of the librarian and the responsibility of the position held. In the United States, in particular, standards are very definite, administrative positions in major institutions being open only to those with university degrees and post-graduate library school training and experience. The university degree and some practical library experience have become prerequisite to admission to the one year course of the professional schools conferring the degree of Bachelor of Library Science, while short or summer courses are given library assistants.

Appendices.—Appended are signed statements of the Departmental Librarians submitting this memorandum showing the education, library training and experience that have gone to the building of the organized libraries of the Service, the size of the libraries, the system of arrangement of material, the number and qualifications of assistants, and the salaries received. Problems created by the Act to amend the Civil Service Act assented to June 14, 1929, will be seen by the reader.

There follow lists showing the salaries received by Departmental Librarians in Great Britain and the United States, where librarians have been accorded professional status. In Great Britain the librarians mentioned with one exception, the lowest paid, are men. In the United States, the Departmental Librarians are mostly women, graduates of universities with library training and experience.

Statistics are also given of salaries in the Library of Parliament where the staff is male, of salaries in the provincial legislative libraries of Canada, and of salaries given to High School and University librarians, to show that even High School librarians in the United States, whose responsibilities are less onerous and whose work exacts much less scholarship, receive higher salaries than the Departmental Librarians of Canada, and that in the United States, Government librarians receive salaries on a level with those given heads of university libraries with larger collections.

In only one organized Government library in Ottawa does the librarian receive a salary corresponding to her professional responsibilities—the Librarian of the National Research Council, who entered the Service in 1929, has been classed as Assistant Research Chemist in the same grade as Assistant Research Chemists, Physicists and Biologists, with a salary range of \$2,820-\$3,300.

Research is an essential part of library work. Although Research Clerks are really the Reference Librarians of a technical library, they receive higher salaries than Departmental Librarians Grade 3, who do extensive research work and have additional administrative responsibilities.

Research Clerks, Grade 1, have a salary range of.....	\$1,560-2,040
Research Clerks, Grade 2, have a salary range of.....	2,160-2,520
Department Librarians, Grade 3, receive.....	1,800-2,220

Uniform insistence on professional qualifications for library positions throughout the Government Service would materially speed the work done by the Departments as a whole. In many Departments the inefficiency of the untrained so-called librarian has led officials to keep important current documents in their own rooms, so that the entire Department suffers from the lack of centralization and accessibility of information.

Which brings us back to the Ridington-Black-Locke Report.

By the Acting Chairman:

Q. Have you any further representations, Miss Hart?—A. No, Mr. Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I think I am only voicing the views of the committee when I say that you have made a very fine presentation, and we will be very glad to give consideration to the recommendations contained therein, and also draw to the attention of the Civil Service Commission and the Departments concerned the summary of your recommendations.

The WITNESS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have here two communications from Mr. Knowles, National Secretary, Amalgamated Civil Servants of Canada, both dated June 5, 1934, *re* Hours of Labour, Hospital Orderlies, and *re* Long Term Temporaries:

(See Appendix hereto.)

The committee adjourned at 12:45 p.m. to meet at the call of the Chair.

APPENDIX

THE CANADIAN LEGION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE

DOMINION HEADQUARTERS, OTTAWA, CANADA

June 5th, 1934.

Mr. J. EARL LAWSON, K.C., M.P.,
Chairman, Special Committee of Parliament on Civil Service,
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR MR. LAWSON,—You will remember that at the time our Dominion President, General Ross, appeared before your Committee, you requested him to submit to you a Memorandum setting out the Legion's views in regard to the operation of the Disability Preference to disabled ex-service men, under the Civil Service Act. General Ross was called away to the West on short notice and asked me to prepare a Memorandum on his behalf. This I have done and copy is enclosed herewith, and I may say that its contents represent the carefully considered opinion of the Canadian Legion.

I feel that if this question is to be taken up further by your Committee an opportunity should be provided for the appearance of representatives from the Amputations' Association, the Tuberculous, the Blind, etc., etc., as these people are vitally interested in the question and have indicated to me their desire to appear, should it be necessary.

I shall be at your service to discuss this question further at any convenient time, should you so desire.

Yours faithfully,

J. R. BOWLER,
General Secretary.

THE CANADIAN LEGION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE SERVICE LEAGUE

DOMINION HEADQUARTERS, OTTAWA, ONTARIO

June 5th, 1934.

MEMORANDUM RE DISABILITY PREFERENCE UNDER CIVIL SERVICE ACT

It has always been the policy of the Dominion Parliament to encourage very strongly the absorption of disabled ex-service men into useful employment.

The literature issued upon the authority of the Government to returning disabled ex-service men, repeatedly and emphatically made it clear that these men were entitled to seek, and obtain employment of any kind or nature, at whatsoever remuneration they could get, without prejudice to their disability pensions.

This principle was laid down in the original Pension Act of 1919. Section 15 states:—

“The occupation or income or condition in life of a person previous to his becoming a member of the forces shall not in any way affect the amount of pension awarded to or in respect of him.”

Section 24, 4, states:—

“No deduction shall be made from the pension of any member of the forces owing to his having undertaken work or perfected himself in some form of industry.”

Both the above Sections have remained without change since the inception of the Pension Act.

As further evidence of Parliament's intention in regard to disabled ex-service men, reference is made to the provision for Vocational Training, which existed for several years after the war. The purpose of this provision was to train disabled men who had become unfitted to pursue their previous occupations, in some form of industry which, notwithstanding their disabilities, they were still able to carry on. The Vocational Training machinery included a widespread scheme for the placement in industry of the men so trained.

Additional evidence of the same nature is found in the fact that shortly after the war the Dominion Government obligated itself to assume responsibility for compensation of certain classes of pensioners who might become injured during the course of their employment. This was done to offset the natural reluctance of employers of labour to assume the responsibility for the employment of men who were admittedly disabled.

A further evidence of the intention of Parliament is found in the Disability Preference Clause in the Civil Service Act, which Section is the cause of the present discussion.

All the above show very clearly the anxiety of Parliament to assist the pensioner to become absorbed in the industrial life of the Country, without prejudice to his pension. There were no doubt excellent reasons for this desire, amongst which the following are suggested:—

- (a) As a recognition of the service and sacrifice of these men, the Country desired to do its utmost to assist them.
- (b) It was not considered desirable that there should be created in Canada a large class of comparatively young, but unemployed, wholly or partially disabled ex-service men, with nothing but idleness before them for the rest of their lives.
- (c) Arising out of (b) is the fact that it would have been impossible to lay down a satisfactory uniform basic rate of pension for all classes (excepting the higher ranks) had it not been clearly laid down that the pensioner was at liberty to supplement his pension in any way that he found possible.

This latter point is a highly important consideration. It is one of the basic reasons for the protest which arose in regard to the Budget proposal of 1932-33, which, if carried out, would have had the effect of offsetting pension against salary in the case of all pensioners employed by the Dominion Government. This proposal, which was directly contrary to the principles referred to above, was ultimately withdrawn. It is highly probable that if such an example had been set by the Dominion Government, it would have been considered a precedent and would have been followed at once by Provincial and Municipal Authorities, and by employers of labour generally. The effect upon pensioners as a class would have been devastating. It would have been considered as a breach of faith, and in all probability would have resulted in a large class of pensioners relinquishing their employment, thus throwing them entirely upon their pensions for their existence. This in turn would have brought up the question of the sufficiency of the basic rates of pension, and would most likely have resulted in a demand for a scale of pension which would provide a comfortable means of livelihood and not simply the necessities of life. It must be remembered that Canadian ex-service men were drawn from all classes of occupations and professions, and it is very questionable if a maximum of Seventy-five (\$75.00)

Dollars per month for a totally disabled man would be considered adequate, if the principle whereby he might augment his pension without prejudice to it, were not applied.

Similar considerations apply in the case of the Disability Preference Clause under the Civil Service Act. There are undoubtedly cases where, on the face of it, it appears unjust to grant preference to a disabled pensioner, who at least has a pension to rely on, as against an ex-service man with equally good service to his Country, but who suffered no war disability. If such cases could be adjusted individually the matter would be comparatively simple. The difficulty lies in the fact, however, that an Amendment to the Act would become necessary, and it is certain that this Amendment would be construed as involving the principle of counting a man's pension as an adverse factor in the matter of employment. This in all probability would immediately cause a great deal of apprehension on the part of the whole body of pensioners, and would result in a similar public protest as in the case of the Budget proposal.

If anything at all were done, it might be possible, as suggested by General Ross, Dominion President of the Legion, in his evidence before your Committee, to provide that a married non-pensioner should have preference as against a single pensioner. However, even this would appear to involve legislation, with all its consequent dangers.

The conclusion is, therefore, that, notwithstanding the apparent injustices in a few cases, it would seem to be unwise to disturb the existing legislation. It should be borne in mind that the years are rapidly passing and it will not be long before all ex-service men, pensioners or otherwise, will necessarily find themselves out of the running. In the meantime it is suggested that so far as is possible, all cases of apparent injustice should be dealt with by way of administration and not by legislation.

It is understood that the number of cases in which there has been complaint in respect to the Disability Preference is very small. As General Ross pointed out in his evidence, it is noteworthy that there have been practically no complaints until quite recent times; and generally speaking the legislation has given satisfaction. In all probability the fact that attention is now drawn to certain cases is simply a manifestation of the economic depression through which the Country has been passing, and due to which there have not been enough positions to go round.

It should be added that before any decision is reached as to the Amendment of the Disability Preference Clause, Organizations of disabled ex-service men, such as The Amputations' Association of the Great War, The Sir Arthur Pearson Club of Blinded Soldiers and Sailors, etc., would undoubtedly expect to have the opportunity of presenting their views before the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

J. R. BOWLER,

General Secretary, Canadian Legion of the B.E.S.L.

AMALGAMATED CIVIL SERVANTS OF CANADA

Respecting Special Delivery Messengers, Post Office Department, and classification as Office Boys—I promised on May 30th last that I would give you information in respect to the earning power of these boys under existing order of things.

I find that in Toronto there are 27 such boys; Montreal, 32; Vancouver, 6; Winnipeg, 8. Total, 73.

The minimum amount earned, on the basis of ten cents per letter, during the last fiscal year was \$20 per month and the maximum during the same period was \$28 per month. It is fair to state that the average earnings of these boys amount to \$24 per month per person.

The classification for the position of Office Boy calls for a minimum salary of \$420 per annum up to the maximum of \$660 per annum. The first two statutory increases to be at the rate of \$30 semi-annually and subsequently increases at the rate of \$60 per annum until the maximum is reached.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the Special Delivery Messengers positions were classified as Office Boy, as requested, there would not need to be so many as are at the present employed which would partly make up for the difference of the salary rate outlined and the amount now received on the basis of ten cents per letter delivered. Furthermore, the Post Office Department would receive service for monies spent during the period of time when no Special Delivery Letters were on hand.

Trusting this is the information you required.

Yours sincerely,

FRED KNOWLES,
National Secretary.

On May 30th last, when speaking on the question of bringing the Income Tax Branch of the Department of National Revenue under the Civil Service Act, you asked me how many of such employees was I speaking on behalf of and I answered that I could not tell you, and I promised to make a statement later.

The reason that I could not tell you how many men are employed in the Income Tax Branch of the Department of National Revenue who are members of our organization is that we do not segregate them by occupations; we segregate them by Departments, that is to say, we have Post Office Groups, National Revenue Groups, Immigration Groups and so on as the case may be.

On looking up my books, I find we have National Revenue Groups in Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge in Alberta; Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo and New Westminster in British Columbia; Moose Jaw, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Regina and Saskatoon in Saskatchewan; Portage La Prairie, Emerson, Brandon and Winnipeg in Manitoba; Sault Ste. Marie, Fort William, Port Arthur and Windsor, Ontario; showing a paid up membership in National Revenue Groups of 515. The resolution requesting that Income Tax Branch of the Department of National Revenue be brought under the Civil Service Act emanated from these Groups and was passed at a Convention of Civil Servants as a whole after being referred to the groups interested, and the resolution passed unanimously.

Yours sincerely,

FRED KNOWLES,
National Secretary.

SUBMISSION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE FEDERATION OF CANADA TO THE SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

1. In re attached statement concerning numbers of prevailing rate employees: It is presumed that the procedure which would be adopted to bring these employees under the Civil Service Superannuation Act would be that such employees would be declared eligible to come under the Fund, contingent upon their conforming to a standard of "permanency", to be defined. Therefore the figures are submitted to show, first, the gross numbers of employees paid at prevailing rates, and, second, the estimated number who might be able to secure recognition of their permanent status. These estimates have been prepared after consultation with officials of the Departments concerned, but are submitted as only tentatively correct.

2. Re machinery of appeal in the Civil Service of the United Kingdom: It is desired to point out that this subject is dealt with in some detail in the "Introductory Memoranda Relating to the Civil Service Submitted by the Treasury (1930)" and the "Report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service, 1929-31". In the Report it is recommended, under the heading of "Machinery of Negotiation" that existing arrangements for arbitration of employees' claims and grievances be continued as they were serving a useful purpose.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Civil Service Federation,

V. C. PHELAN,
President.

June 6, 1934.

STATEMENT CONCERNING DOMINION GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES PAID AT "PRE-
VAILING RATES", i.e., EMPLOYEES WHOSE RATE OF PAY IS FIXED ON THE
BASIS OF A WORKING PERIOD OF LESS THAN A FULL YEAR

Department	Column 1 Gross Numbers of Employees Reported as at March 31st 1934	Column 2 Estimated Number of Positions Which Might Reasonably Conform to a Definition of "Permanency"
Agriculture.....	904	500
Fisheries.....	208	208
Immigration.....	12	1
Indian Affairs.....	21	Nil
Interior.....	217	27
Marine.....	432	432
Mines.....	54	54
National Defence.....	599	323
National Revenue.....	10	10
Pensions and National Health.....	42	42
Public Works.....	1,236	500
Public Printing and Stationery.....	405	405
Post Office.....	15	15
Railways and Canals.....	1,214	237
Trade and Commerce (Federal Grain Commission).....	174	174
Total.....	5,543	2,928

EXPLANATORY NOTES:

1. It is to be noted in the case of the Public Works Department that the figure 1,236 does not include telegraph agents and operators, whereas the estimate of 500 takes account of these classes.

2. In the case of the same Department and Public Works, some casual employees engaged on works of construction and repair throughout Canada are included under "gross number of employees reported" although not all in that category are included in the figure of 1,236.

3. The factors chiefly responsible for the considerable discrepancy between columns 1 and 2 are: (a) certain employees doing casual or irregular work are included in column 1; (b) certain employees earning a total sum of less than \$600 are included in column 1.

AMALGAMATED CIVIL SERVANTS OF CANADA

Re: Hours of Labour Hospital Orderlies

You asked me for some figures in connection with hours of labour of Hospital Orderlies, Department of Pensions and National Health.

Day duty—7.30 a.m. to 7.30 p.m. every other day; 7.30 a.m. to 1.30 p.m. every other day. One Sunday off in four and all statutory holidays or time off in lieu of the latter is allowed.

Night duty: This happened once in four months; 7.30 p.m. to 7.30 a.m. for the whole month; no time allowed off while on night duty, but time off in lieu of statutory holidays is allowed when resuming day duty.

The above affects Medical Orderlies, Deer Lodge Hospital, Winnipeg, Man.

Westminster Hospital, London, Ont. Hours of duty in day work—11 hours per day with one hour off for meals. Night duty—13 hours per night with one hour off for meals, or a total of 72 hours per week. Time in lieu thereof is granted for statutory holidays. Approximately, the same condition appertains in other hospitals under the jurisdiction of the Department of Pensions and National Health.

We contend that the duties of Medical Orderlies in Government Hospitals cannot be deemed as intermittent in character and that these employees should be given the privilege of the 8-hour day or 44-hour week legislation.

Yours sincerely,

FRED. KNOWLES.

Re: Long-Term Temporaries

In giving evidence in support of these people being made permanent I attempted to outline the conditions under which these persons were reduced in salary up to a maximum of \$300 on loss of dependents. Explanation of how this happens is more or less intricate but I will attempt to make it as clear as possible.

The salary rate for these classes in the main is minimum \$900 to a maximum of \$1,140. That is the salary rate as laid down by the Civil Service Commission for the work assigned. During the war years a bonus of \$120 and down was given to Civil Servants on a sliding scale; the greater the salary, the lower the bonus. Later on the bonus was absorbed into salary for the permanent service. These long-term temporaries, being temporary employees, remain at the minimum of their class which is \$900, and when bonus was absorbed into salary the sum of \$300 was added to the \$900 and paid to the incumbent providing that he filled out, annually, a "head of household" form, showing that he had dependents. When he reaches the stage that his wife dies or if a widower, his children reach age 18 years, he is not able to fill out a "head of household" form, and thereby loses the \$300 that was absorbed into salary. In cases of persons who were permanent at the time the bonus was absorbed into salary and were at the minimum of their class, what happened was as follows.

The following year they received a statutory increase of \$120 making the salary \$1,020 and the bonus \$180. The following year they again received an increase in salary of \$120 making the salary \$1,140 and the bonus \$60. In these cases when dependency ceases the \$60 which is in excess of the maximum salary of their class is taken away from them and they receive the normal salary of \$1,140 maximum.

Thus it will be seen that if a man had been 30 years, which has happened in some cases, as a permanent temporary, after giving that service he is reduced to \$900 per annum on loss of dependents, on the other hand, a person who was made permanent with much less service is allowed to go to the maximum of his class which is \$1,140, and does not get less than the maximum of his class when dependency ceases. This situation is not very good and naturally enough creates dissatisfaction between individuals doing the same work in the same building.

If this matter is straightened out the cost to the country would be negligible if anything at all due to the fact that those now in the service receiving, with bonus and salary combined, equal to or more than the maximum salary of their class. In recent years the following have had \$300 deducted from their salaries because of loss of dependents:—

Chas. Blair, Elevator Operator, Ottawa, Ont.
 C. K. Smith, Caretaker, P.B., Windsor, N.S.
 F. G. Devey, Elevator Operator, Winnipeg, Man.
 A. Poulin, Elevator Operator, Quebec, Que.
 James Carse, Caretaker P.B., Kitchener, Ont.
 A. E. Hale, Cleaner and Helper, Toronto, Ont.
 M. Rochford, Station Engineer, Montreal, Que.
 Jas. Sterling, Caretaker P.B., Eganville, Ont.
 Wm. H. Bethume, Caretaker P.B., Yarmouth, N.S.
 J. Doherty, Elevator Operator, Montreal, P.Q.
 A. Gaignery, Cleaner and Helper, Montreal, P.Q.
 H. Montigny, Cleaner and Helper, Montreal, P.Q.
 J. Peacock, Elevator Operator, Montreal, P.Q.
 N. Taylor, Caretaker P.B., Grand Forks, B.C.
 J. McCourt, Cleaner and Helper, Vancouver, B.C.
 A. Teasdale, Elevator Operator, Montreal, P.Q.
 M. Hart, Caretaker P.B., Deseronto, Ont.

This is in the Public Works Department, and there are still 268 on the list as drawing the \$300 in lieu of bonus in that department.

I understand that in the statement given to your committee by the Civil Service Commission the full details of the employees in all departments are stated, showing in each case who and who is not in receipt of bonus in lieu of a flat increase in salary, so it is hardly necessary for me to duplicate that information. Trusting this is clear to you.

I trust that your committee will see its way clear to straighten out this tangle in the interests of fair play because to our mind there is not the slightest doubt that these persons who were in the service prior to the stopping of the blanketing-in regulations should have been made permanent at that time and a condition of this sort could not have arisen.

Yours sincerely,

FRED. KNOWLES,
National Secretary.

SESSION 1934
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

CIVIL SERVICE ACT

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 11

MONDAY, JUNE 25, 1934

REPORT

OTTAWA
J. O. PATENAUDE
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1934

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, June 25, 1934.

FOURTH REPORT

The Select Special Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the administration and operation of the Civil Service Act as amended, with instructions to inquire into and report concerning the repeal or amendment of any of the provisions of the said Act or the substitution therefor or addition thereto of other provisions as the Committee may deem advisable, begs leave to present the following as its Fourth Report:—

1. Representations have been made to your Committee urging that certain temporary employees who have for long periods been occupying positions of a permanent nature should now be accorded permanent status.

Your Committee find that by Orders in Council, P.C. 2958, dated the 16th day of December, 1920, and P.C. 3895, dated October 22, 1921, passed pursuant to the Civil Service Amendment Act, October, 1919, 4,060 temporary employees who had been continuously employed in positions of a permanent character since November 10, 1919 (the date on which the Civil Service Act became law) were, during the period 1920-27, given permanent status. In 1927, however, the enabling Orders in Council were rescinded. The representations which have been made to your Committee urge that any other temporary employees (approximately 300 in number) who were eligible to benefit under this section of the Act and said Orders in Council but whose permanency was not at the time effected should now be granted permanent status, in order that they may enjoy the benefits attached thereto. These benefits include the right to contribute to the Civil Service Superannuation Act, the right to receive statutory increases when these are again allowed, the right to compete for promotions when promotions are again authorized, and the right to receive retiring leave on separation from the Service. A large number of the employees in question have already been permitted to contribute to the Civil Service Superannuation Act, so that the additional burden on that fund will be small, and as all statutory increases and the great majority of promotions are at present prohibited, there will be little, if any, additional cost in this connection nor in connection with the question of compensation, as employees will continue to receive the salaries which they are now paid.

Your Committee believes that there is justification for the granting of permanent status to the employees in question, and recommends that the Civil Service Commission be instructed to prepare the necessary regulations for submission to the Governor in Council to give effect thereto.

2. Representations have also been made to your Committee that permanent status should be conferred upon the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board, which has since 1918 been operating almost entirely on a temporary basis.

It is represented that as a result of reorganization the staff has now reached a permanent basis, having been reduced from a peak figure of 1,595 to a present figure of 343. The great majority of the members of the staff are returned soldiers and have been employed continuously for long periods of service—in

many cases up to fifteen years. Your Committee finds that in 1928 action in this respect was taken in connection with the staff of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Your Committee is of opinion that the action requested is in the public interest, and recommends that the Soldier Settlement Act be amended to provide that:—

Such members of the staff of the Soldier Settlement Board as may be designated by the Governor in Council shall, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act, be regarded as permanent employees, provided that their positions are certified by the Civil Service Commission, upon the recommendation of the Minister based upon the report, in writing of the Deputy Minister, to be of indeterminate duration, and shall thereafter become subject in all respects to the Civil Service Act.

3. Representations have been made to your Committee on behalf of employees receiving prevailing rates of pay, urging that they be allowed to contribute to the Civil Service Superannuation Fund.

Section 2 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act limits the benefits of that Act to permanent full-time employees "who are in receipt of a stated annual salary of at least \$600." The employees on whose behalf representations have been made could accordingly secure the benefits of the Superannuation Act only by having their salary rate changed from a prevailing rate basis to a stated annual salary, or by amending the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act in this regard.

With respect to this and other matters relative to the application of the Superannuation Act the factors involved are of so complicated a nature that your Committee was unable to obtain sufficiently definite or comprehensive information to warrant a recommendation. Moreover the Committee is of opinion that the question is one that does not properly come within its terms of reference. In any case it is understood that these matters are under consideration by the Advisory Committee on the Superannuation Act to which body your Committee suggests the representations above specified be referred.

4. Your Committee has been pleased to note that since the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission substantial progress has been made in carrying out the recommendations of the Special Committee of 1932, and that action is being taken in connection with overlapping and the reorganization of certain services. Your Committee particularly urges that the progress which has already been made in absorbing surplus personnel and thus obviating the necessity of filling vacancies with new personnel, be extended to the greatest degree possible.

5. Attention has been drawn to Recommendation No. 21 contained in the Report of the Civil Service Committee of 1932, recommending the setting up of a Board to adjudicate upon complaints of civil servants.

It has been alleged that this Board has not functioned due to the fact that no person has been designated to convene the Board.

Your Committee finds that the Civil Service Commission has been dealing with complaints of civil servants by means of conferences with representatives of civil service organizations and with representatives of the Departments concerned.

Your Committee recommends that the civil servant organization, of which the complainant is a member, should notify the Civil Service Commission of its desire to have a complaint considered and that the Commission then take the necessary steps to have such Board convened.

6. Your Committee has had placed before it numerous other representations containing much useful information regarding conditions in the public service in connection with all of which careful consideration has been given. It has not, however, been practicable to deal definitely with all the matters submitted and it is accordingly recommended that such matters appearing on the record not dealt with specifically by this Report be investigated by the Civil Service Commission so that where possible the necessary action may be taken. And furthermore that the Commission submit a full report upon the matters involved to such Select Committee on Civil Service matters as may be set up at a subsequent session.

7. Your Committee finds itself in sympathy with the representations made to it that the full restoration of promotions and increases and compensations in the Service would be in the public interest and recommends that such steps be taken as soon as financial conditions warrant.

8. Your Committee has been greatly assisted by the evidence and information placed before it by the several civil servants' associations, and has been impressed with the high efficiency and morale of the public service as indicated thereby.

A copy of the printed proceedings and evidence is submitted herewith.

J. L. BOWMAN,

Acting Chairman.



GretagMacbeth™ ColorChecker Color Rendition Chart

